# SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

## Its Theory and Practice

# SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

## Its Theory and Practice

BY

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.LITT.

*Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College; Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint and Speaker Lecturer, Oxford; Hon. D.D. Aberdeen*

United
BS
680
.S2
G7
16,590

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1925

G 792

Oxford University Press
*London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen*
*New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town*
*Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai*
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY

Printed in England

# EDITORIAL NOTE

WHEN the sudden death of Dr. Gray in November 1922 deprived the world of Old Testament study of its most distinguished scholar, some fear was felt that comparatively little of the results of his work during recent years remained. Happily, however, several important manuscripts were discovered amongst his papers, and Mrs. Gray very readily gave permission for their publication. In particular the lectures on Sacrifice which he had delivered before the University of Oxford as Speaker Lecturer were found to be nearly complete. No doubt their form would have been somewhat different if Dr. Gray had been able to revise his own material for the Press, and in several of the lectures there were signs that he had already considered more than one alternative form of presentation. Of one lecture—on the Laws of J, E, and D, relating to the Passover—only a few disconnected sheets have been found, and it seems likely that the rest had been destroyed in order to be rewritten, for of the first page or two no less than three variant copies survived. In other cases it has not always been easy to decide between different arrangements, but it is hoped that the present volume represents as nearly as possible that which Dr. Gray intended at the time of his death.

The work of preparing the book for publication has necessarily been slow. The lectures on the Priesthood were not found till all the rest had been transcribed and was practically ready for the Press. The sheets of translation from the *Megillath Ta'anith* (cp. pp. 279, 407 ff.) had disappeared, and the section indicated in the main body of the text had to be translated afresh. This has now been inserted as Appendix III. It is possible that an extended treatment of the Materials of Sacrifice formed part of Dr. Gray's original plan for the completed book, and as the subject is only lightly touched in the lectures themselves, Mrs. Gray gave permission for the use of another manuscript from which Appendix I has been copied. There was no direct clue as to

16,590

the order in which the different subjects were to be placed, except for the fact that the section on the Theory of Sacrifice clearly came first, and the arrangement in this volume is not necessarily that which Dr. Gray himself would have chosen.

Many hands have contributed to the preparation of the book. The thanks of all who are interested in it are due to two Oxford scholars, Mr. G. R. Driver, of Magdalen College, and Canon D. C. Simpson, of Keble College, for reading the proofs. The former has also checked the references to secular literature, and the latter the Biblical references—both being tasks whose magnitude and importance will be indicated by a glance at the index. Some editorial additions have been made to the text—nearly all of them are reference figures—and these have been placed in square brackets. Several Rabbinic citations which baffled other readers were verified by Canon G. H. Box, who further rendered valuable help with the translation from the *Mᵉgillath Taʿanith*, though he is not to be held finally responsible for it. Dr. S. A. Cook, of Caius College, Cambridge, has assisted in the checking of the Minaean inscriptions in the text and in Appendix II. Numerous members of the Society for Old Testament Study (of which Dr. Gray was President when he died) have contributed to the Bibliography which follows the Contents. Mention must also be made of the fine quality of the work done by the Clarendon Press, whose comments and criticisms have not merely exhibited the accuracy, care, and critical acumen which are to be expected from first-class proof-readers, but have also shown a high degree of scholarship, and a more than passing familiarity with the recondite material which Dr. Gray's wide learning led him to use from time to time. The remainder of the clerical work involved in the production of the volume has been done by an old pupil, who had learnt to value his teacher's genius for friendship even more highly than his unique scholarship.

# CONTENTS


PAGE

EDITORIAL NOTE . . . . . v

A LIST OF DR. GRAY'S PUBLISHED CONTRIBUTIONS TO OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES . . . . . ix

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . xii

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA . . . . . xv

THE THEORY OF SACRIFICE.

1. Sacrifice and Sacred Offerings, i . . . . . 1
2. Sacrifice and Sacred Offerings, ii . . . . . 21
3. Sacrifice and Sacred Offerings, iii . . . . . 41
4. Sacrifice, Propitiation, and Expiation, i . . . . . 55
5. Sacrifice, Propitiation, and Expiation, ii . . . . . 67
6. Sacrifice, Propitiation, and Expiation, iii . . . . . 82

THE ALTAR.

7. Literary and Archaeological Evidence . . . . . 96
8. Earlier History . . . . . 114
9. Later History . . . . . 130
10. The Sacrificial Service in Heaven, i . . . . . 148
11. The Sacrificial Service in Heaven, ii . . . . . 164

THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD.

12. The Terms for Cultic Persons . . . . . 179
13. The Mosaic Priesthood . . . . . 194
14. The Early Priesthood . . . . . 211
15. Later Limitations and Extensions . . . . . 225
16. The Levitical Priesthood . . . . . 239
17. The High Priest . . . . . 256

THE FESTIVALS.

18. The Festal Calendars . . . . . 271
19. New Year's Day and Some Other Festivals . . . . . 285
20. The Day of Atonement . . . . . 306
21. The Sheaf . . . . . 323

PAGE

22. The Paschal Victim . . . . . 337
23. The Blood Ritual of the Passover . . . . 352
24. The Paschal Meal . . . . . 367
25. Passover and the New Testament . . . . . 383

APPENDIX I. Note on the Materials of Sacrifice . . . 398
II. Minaean Inscriptions illustrating ch. iv . . 406
III. Selection from the *Mᵉgillath Ta'anith* . . . 407

INDEXES.

I. General . . . . . 411
II. Authors cited . . . . . 419
III. Arabic words and phrases . . . . . 421
IV. Assyrian words and phrases . . . . . 421
V. Greek words and phrases . . . . . 421
VI. Hebrew and Aramaic words and phrases . . . . 422
VII. Biblical References.
(a) Old Testament . . . . . 425
(b) Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha . . . . 430
(c) New Testament . . . . . 431
VIII. Post-Biblical Jewish References.
(a) Rabbinic . . . . . 431
(b) Greek . . . . . 432

# LIST OF WORKS PUBLISHED BY DR. G. BUCHANAN GRAY

## BOOKS

Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. London, 1896
The Divine Discipline of Israel. London, 1900
Numbers (Temple Bible). London, 1902
Commentary on Numbers (ICC). Edinburgh, 1903
Commentary on Isaiah 1–39 (ICC). (Vol. I containing chs. 1–27). Edinburgh, 1912
A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. London, 1913
The Forms of Hebrew Poetry. London, 1915
(With S. R. Driver) Commentary on Job (ICC). Edinburgh, 1921

## ARTICLES

*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.*

Critical Notes on the Text of Job. Jan. 1920
A Critical Note (on Jastrow's Book of Job). Oct. 1921

*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (R. H. Charles).

Psalms of Solomon.

*Cambridge Ancient History.*

Vol. iv, chs. 1 and 7 on Ancient Persia.

*Contemporary Review.*

The Comparative Criticism of Semitic Literature. July, 1907
Samuel Rolles Driver April, 1914

*Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

Articles on: Ahitub; Ammi, Names with; Angel; Anointing; Bush § 2 (The 'burning bush'); Camp § 2 (In the wilderness [P]); Demons §§ 1–5; Destroyer; Jealousy, Ordeal of; Law Literature; Names §§ 87–107, § 125, i–iii; Pillar of Cloud and Fire; Satan §§ 1–4; Satyrs; Theophany; Tribes §§ 9–10; Wanderings, Wilderness of.

*Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th edition).

Bible: Old Testament; Textual Criticism.
Bible: Old Testament; Higher Criticism.

*Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.*

Names (Hebrew).

*Expositor*

Series IV.

The Parallel Passages in Joel in their bearing on the Question of Date. viii. 208–22

Isaiah's Anticipations of the Future: Some Recent Theories. x. 330–34

Series V.

The Character of the Proper Names in the Priestly Code: A Reply to Professor Hommel. vi. 173–19

Professor Sayce's 'Early History of the Hebrews'. vii. 337–35

The Alphabetic Poem in Nahum. viii. 207–22

Series VI.

The Royal Ancestry of Zephaniah. ii. 76–8

The Lists of the Twelve Tribes. v. 225–24

The View from Mount Nebo. x. 321–34

The 'Steppes of Moab'. xi. 68–7

Series VII.

The Alphabetic Structure of Psalms 9 and 10. ii. 233–25

The Heavenly Temple and the Heavenly Altar. iv. 385–402, 530–54

The Excavations at Gezer and Religion in Ancient Palestine. viii. 423–44

Series VIII.

The Virgin Birth in Relation to the Interpretation of Isaiah $8^{14}$. i. 289–30

The Forms of Hebrew Poetry. v. 421–441, 552–568 vi. 45–60, 117–140, 221–244, 306–328, 529–55

Interpretations of Jewish Sacrifice. ix. 385–40

The Antiquity and Perpetuity of Sacrifice. ix. 528–55

The Sacrifice of Cain and Abel. x. 1–2

The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job. xix. 422–43

Cain's Sacrifice: A New Theory. xxi. 161–18

The Misuse of the Term 'Lamb' in the E.V. xxii. 241–26

*Expository Times.*

Is Joel a Unity? vi. 9

Professor Hommel and the Evidential Value of Hebrew Proper Names. viii. 555–55

Nebo as an Element in Hebrew Proper Names: Machnadebai and Barnabas. x. 232–23

The Title 'King of Persia'. xxv. 245–25

'Breach for Breach' and 'The Breach of his People'. xxvi. 347–35

A Group of Hebrew Names of the Ninth Century B.C. xxvii. 57–6

Profane Nations xxix. 250–254
Job, Ecclesiastes, and a New Babylonian Literary Fragment. xxxi. 440–443

*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.*

Articles on Glory (O.T.), Name, Names (Proper), and numerous short articles, mainly on proper names.

*Jewish Quarterly Review.*

Note on the Text and interpretation of Ecclus. $41^{19}$. July 1897, pp. 567–572
The Encyclopaedia Biblica and the Textual Tradition of Hebrew Proper Names. April, 1901

*Journal of Theological Studies.*

The Nazirite. Vol. i (1900), pp. 210 ff.
A Questionable Plural in Hebrew Vol. iv (1903), p. 124
The Greek Version of Isaiah: is it the work of a single Translator? Vol. xii (1911), p. 286 ff.

*New World.*

The Growth of the Prophetic Literature. March, 1899

*Oxford Society for Historical Theology.*

Hebrew Monotheism (Presidential Address for the year 1921–22).

*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements.*

An Old Hebrew Calendar from Gezer. Jan. 1909
Supplementary Remarks on the Gezer Calendar. July, 1909
The Gezer Inscription: a correction July, 1911
An Inscribed Jewish Ossuary: a correction. July, 1914
Crocodiles in Palestine. Oct. 1920

*Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review.*

The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament. Oct. 1904

*Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology.*

Notes on the Names in an Egyptian Aramaic Papyrus (Appendix to a paper by A. Cowley). June, 1903, pp. 259–266

*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

Critical Discussions; Isaiah $25^{1-5}$, 26, $34^{12-14}$. 1911, pp. 111 ff.
The Strophic Division of Isaiah $21^{1-10}$ and Isaiah $11^{1-8}$. 1912, pp. 190 ff.
Children named after Ancestors in the Aramaic Papyri from Elephantine and Assuan (Wellhausen-Festschrift) 1914, pp. 161 ff.

# ABBREVIATIONS

The Abbreviations used in this volume include the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| *AHT* | F. Hommel: *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, as illustrated by the Monuments.* |
| Am. | Amos. |
| *Ant.* | Josephus: *Antiquities of the Jews.* |
| *APFC* | A. Cowley: *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* |
| Aq. | Aquila. |
| Ar. | Arabic. |
| *Ar. Des.* | Doughty: *Arabia Deserta.* |
| A.T. | Alte Testament, alttestamentlich. |
| *ATAO* | A. Jeremias: *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients.* |
| A.V. | Authorized Version. |
| *BDB* | F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs: *A Hebrew Lexicon.* |
| Bech. | Mishnah Tractate *Bᵉchôrôth.* |
| Ber. R. | Bᵉrêshîth Rabba. |
| Bik. | Mishnah Tractate *Bikkûrîm.* |
| *B. J., De Bell. Jud.* | Josephus: *De Bellis Judaeorum.* |
| B.N.T. | A. Jeremias: *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament.* |
| C. | G. A. Cooke: *North Semitic Inscriptions.* |
| *c.* | *circa.* |
| C. and H. | J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford Battersby: *The Hexateuch.* |
| *C. Ap.* | Josephus: *Contra Apionem.* |
| Cant. | Song of Solomon. |
| Cent. B. | Century Bible. |
| Chron. | Chronicles. |
| *CIS* | *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.* |
| Comp. | J. Wellhausen: *Composition of the Hexateuch.* |
| Cor. (I, II) | Corinthians (I, II) |
| Cp. | Compare. |
| Ct. | Contrast. |
| Da. | A. B. Davidson. |
| Dan. | Daniel. |
| *DB* | Hastings: *Dictionary of the Bible.* |
| *De Decal.* | Philo: *De Decalogo.* |
| *De Praem.* | Philo: *De Praemiis.* |
| *De Septen.* | Philo: *De Septenario.* |
| *De Vict. Off.* | Philo: *De Victimas offerentibus.* |
| *De Vit(a) M(os).* | Philo: *De Vita Mosis.* |
| Di. | A. Dillmann. |
| Dr. | S. R. Driver. |
| Dt. | Deuteronomy. |
| E | Elohistic document of the Hexateuch. |
| *E. Bi.* | *Encyclopaedia Biblica.* |
| Ecclus. | Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of Ben Sira). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Ed. | Edition (in square brackets = Editor). |
| En. | Enoch. |
| Eph. | Lidzbarski: *Ephemeris.* |
| ERE | Hastings: *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.* |
| Est. | Esther. |
| E. T. | English Translation. |
| Eus. | Eusebius. |
| E.V(V). | English Version(s), i.e. both the Authorized and the Revised. |
| Ex. | Exodus. |
| Ez. | Ezra. |
| Ezek. | Ezekiel. |
| Gen., Gn. | Genesis. |
| H | The Law of Holiness. |
| Hag. | Haggai. |
| Heb. | Epistle to the Hebrews. |
| Hebr. | Hebrew. |
| Hos. | Hosea. |
| HPS | H. P. Smith. |
| ICC | *International Critical Commentary.* |
| Is. | Isaiah. |
| J | Yahwistic document of the Hexateuch. |
| JBL | *Journal of Biblical Literature.* |
| Jer. | Jeremiah. |
| Jn. | John. |
| Jos. | Joshua. |
| JP | Schürer: *History of the Jewish People* (E.T.). |
| JTS. | *Journal of Theological Studies.* |
| Jub. | Jubilees. |
| Jud. | Judges. |
| KAT | Schrader: *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.* |
| Ketub. | Mishnah Tractate *K*ᵉ*thûbhôth.* |
| Ki. | Kings. |
| Kid. | Mishnah Tractate *Ḳiddûsh.* |
| Kit. | R. Kittel. |
| KHC | *Kurzer Handcommentar.* |
| Lev. | Leviticus. |
| Lex. | *BDB.* |
| Lk. | Luke. |
| LXX | Septuagint. |
| Macc. | Maccabees. |
| Mal. | Malachi. |
| Mand. | Hermas: *Mandata.* |
| Meg. | Mishnah Tractate *M*ᵉ*gillôth.* |
| Men. | Mishnah Tractate *M*ᵉ*nachôth.* |
| Mi. | Micah. |
| Mid. | Mishnah Tractate *Middôth.* |
| Mk. | Mark |
| MT | Massoretic Text. |
| Mt. | Matthew. |
| Ned. | Mishnah Tractate *N*ᵉ*darîm.* |
| Neh. | Nehemiah. |
| Now. | Nowack. |
| NSE | Lidzbarski: *Nordsemitische Epigraphik.* |
| NSI | G. A. Cooke: *North Semitic Inscriptions.* |
| N.T. | New Testament. |
| Num. | Numbers. |
| Numbers. | G. B. Gray: *Commentary on Numbers* (ICC). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Or. | Orelli. |
| O.T. | Old Testament. |
| *OTJC* | W. R. Smith: *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.* |
| P | Priestly document of the Hexateuch. |
| P.C. | Priestly Code. |
| *PEF* (*Qu. St.*) | *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements.* |
| Pent. | Pentateuch. |
| $P^g$ | Groundwork of P or of P.C. |
| Phoen. | Phoenician. |
| Pr., Prov. | Proverbs. |
| *Praep. Ev.* | Eusebius: *Praeparatio Evangelica.* |
| *PRE* | *Protestantische Real-Encyclopädie.* |
| $P^s$ | Later strata of P or P.C. |
| Ps(s). | Psalm(s). |
| R. | Rabbi. |
| *RAH* | J. Wellhausen: *Reste arabischen Heidenthums.* |
| *Rel. Sem.* | W. R. Smith: *The Religion of the Semites.* |
| *RES.* | *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique.* |
| Rev. | Revelation. |
| Rom. | Romans. |
| R.V. | Revised Version. |
| Sam. | Samuel. |
| *Sanh.* | Mishnah Tractate *Sanhedrin.* |
| *SBOT* | *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament* ('*Polychrome Bible*'). |
| *Schab., Shab.* | Mishnah Tractate *Shabbath.* |
| *Sim.* | Hermas: *Similitudes.* |
| *Sir.* | Ecclus. |
| *Suk.* | Mishnah Tractate *Sukkah.* |
| Syr. | Syriac. |
| *Ta'an.* | Mishnah Tractate *Ta'aniiôth.* |
| Test. | Testament. |
| Th. Tij. | Theologisch Tijdschrift. |
| Theod. | Theodotion. |
| Tob. | Tobit. |
| We. | J. Wellhausen. |
| *WAW* | *Philosophisch-historische Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften.* |
| *ZAW* | *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.* |
| *ZDMG* | *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.* |
| Zeb. | Mishnah Tractate *Z$^e$bahîm.* |
| Zech. | Zechariah. |
| Zeph. | Zephaniah |

# ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

13, l. 23. Neh. $10^{35}$—Add [E.V.$^{34}$].
21. Add as footnote to the second paragraph : See also Appendix I.
29, l. 2. Neh. $10^{34-38}$—Add [E.V.$^{33-37}$].
l. 7. ראשית—Add , v. $^{38}$.
63. Footnote. For Appendix A read Appendix II.
78. Footnote. For Jub. $7^{13}$ read Jub. $7^{5}$.
98. Footnote. For Or. read Dr.
146, l. 5 from bottom. For Jewis read Jewish.
158, l. 22. For (6) read ($6^{18}$).
175, l. 6. For *ιερον* read *ιερὸν*.
189, l. 6. Ps. $68^{28}$ ff.—Add [E.V.$^{24}$ ff.].
257, l. 9 from bottom. For Jehoida read Jehoiada.
283, l. 23. For מים read ימים.

# I

## SACRIFICE AND SACRED OFFERINGS

### i

'THE predominance assigned in ancient ritual to animal acrifices corresponds to the predominance of the type of acrifice which is not a mere payment of tribute, but an act f social fellowship between the deity and his worshippers.' The leading idea in the animal sacrifices of the Semites . . . as not that of a gift made over to the god, but of an act of ommunion, in which the god and his worshippers unite by artaking together of the flesh and blood of a sacred victim.'

In these two sentences from Robertson Smith's preliminary urvey of Semitic sacrifices, we have a succinct statement of the undamental position which it was the aim of the last six ectures on the *Religion of the Semites* to establish. In the ourse of the lectures the position was so far advanced that was argued that in communion, not in the making of a gift, s to be found the origin of many even of those rites which n the course of time developed so far or became so modified hat they wore no longer the appearance of an act of communion r of social fellowship: for example, that offering which in Hebrew ritual was burnt whole on the altar, and those sacrifices f the Arabs in which the sacred flesh was left to be devoured y wild beasts, certainly do not suggest an act of fellowship. But Robertson Smith attempted to trace back even these to n original conception of sacrifice as an act of fellowship.

But while Robertson Smith thus did much to gain recognition r ampler recognition for the part played by the idea of com- munion in the history of sacrifice, he certainly did not himself all in question the association of the idea of gift with many ctual sacrifices among the later Jews. Even in the two sentences have cited he speaks not of the exclusive presence, but the

*predominance* in ancient sacrifice of the act of social fellowship, of communion being not the only but the leading idea in it. It is not so certain, however, that the influence of his fascinating theory and persuasive argument has not tended to give a wrong impression of the relative strength of the two ideas of gift and communion in historical times, even though his theory of the complete priority of the idea of communion in prehistoric times could be admitted in all its rigour.

It is not my purpose in these lectures to examine the validity and sufficiency of Robertson Smith's theory of the *origin* of sacrifice; nor will it be my direct aim to examine the extent to which the idea of communion was present to the minds of those who participated in sacrificial acts at any time between the age of Moses and the cessation of sacrifice in A.D. 70, though this latter end will of necessity be in some measure indirectly served by what I do propose to attempt in this and the subsequent lectures. I propose to examine the extent to which, at various periods in the history of the Hebrew religion, the idea of gift was consciously associated with sacrifice, the extent to which sacrifice was subsumed under the general class of sacred gifts, and the depth and variety of the belief that gifts, whether sacrifices or not, could be and ought to be made by man to God.

Some of the gifts made to God came to be regarded as purely and simply gifts; their gift character, whatever they may have been originally, was ultimately so complete that there was no room left for any conception of communion to be associated with them. Some of these gifts would not be included in a modern classification of sacrifices; others, possibly, would. But that, however, as it may, there are sacrifices which were certainly regarded as gifts to God, and which were something more than or something else as well as, gifts. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel[1] were gifts; and if the narrative of Gen. 4 stood by itself it might be precarious to assert that they were anything more than gifts; it is true the allusion to the fat of Abel's sacrifice is such as to indicate that this gift was of *slain* animals; but if this was not rendered significant by what we otherwise know

[1] See *Expositor*, July 1915, pp. 1–23 [also *Expositor*, March 1921, pp. 161–82].

of Hebrew sacrifice, we should have no reason for seeking in this fact any further explanation than this: that as Cain presented vegetables fit for food, so Abel presented animals for food. But there are other stories of sacrifice, and there is one species of sacrifice defined in the laws, that would immediately challenge any theory that attempted to represent all sacrifices as having been regarded, or perhaps it would be safer to say, as having been treated, even in historical times, as gifts to God and nothing more. When a man slays an animal, gives *small* portions to Yahweh, but together with his friends eats the *larger* part himself, the whole proceeding is obviously something more than, or rather other than, the simple presentation of a gift to God. I refer to this matter, though only quite summarily, here in order to preclude the supposition that I am arguing that all sacrifices ever were or came to be treated as nothing but gifts. What that something more may have been, and how clear a conception of what it was, may have been present in the minds of those who at various periods thus sacrificed, is a sufficiently interesting and important question, but not that with which we are at present concerned. For at present I am concerned with sacrifices as gifts, and with the place of gifts to God in Hebrew theory and practice.

The presentation of gifts to God was—at times at least—an important element in Hebrew practice, and the conviction that they could and did make such gifts an important element in Hebrew thought. And this practice and this belief are worth examination—as to their continuity and as to the varying degrees of intensity with which the idea of gift made itself felt at various periods—even apart from questions of the exact nature of the gifts, the method of their presentation, or the purpose with which they were given.

In attempting to estimate the intensity of the conception of gifts to Yahweh in Jewish religion, I begin with terminology. In itself terminology may be a precarious guide to the vital conceptions and ideas of any given period, except of that in which the terminology first arose; but properly checked it has generally something to say, and on the present subject, as a matter of fact, it is particularly significant.

Nowhere more than in the terminology of sacrifice is transla-

tion inadequate and even positively misleading. Partly owing to insuperable difficulties in rendering Hebrew into English, partly owing to unnecessary inconsistencies in translation, the common English versions are a very untrustworthy guide to the conceptions expressed in the Hebrew terminology of sacrifice; the reader of these versions is in constant danger of inferring the presence of the conception of gift where there is in reality no trace of it, and on the other hand he will find only obscure traces of it in many cases where it is actually conspicuous in the original. And so great is the influence of these versions that it often affects the reader of the Hebrew text; it is only too easy to read the term *'ōlāh*, which does not express the idea of gift, but to think burnt-*offering*, which does. This fact will, I hope, be sufficient excuse for discussing the Hebrew forms with reference to the translations of them in the English versions.

There are two terms employed in the English versions which most immediately suggest the idea of gifts to God: the first is the word 'gift' itself, the second is 'offering'; for an offering is but a gift presented for acceptance, and, if accepted, as most of the offerings in question were regarded as being, it becomes a gift. A third term, 'oblation,' occurs some forty times in the A.V., much more frequently in the R.V. Whether the reasons for or against the admission of this last term as a rendering are strongest, and whether the Revisers were well advised in their use of it, may appear later. But the following observations may be made at once: (1) the R.V. substitutes 'oblation' for 'offering' (A.V.) more than sixty times, and occasionally for a compound expression, such as 'meat-offering', into which offering enters; (2) in three passages the R.V. substitutes 'oblation' for 'sacrifice' (A.V.)—viz. in 1 Ki. $18^{29, 36}$ where the Hebrew term is *minḥah*, and in Lev. $27^{11}$ where the Hebrew is *ḳorbān*; (3) though the A.V. uses the form 'oblation' nearly forty times and the R.V. over a hundred times in the O.T., neither version uses it at all in the N.T.; this, however, is not due to the obsolescence of the sacrificial term or terms so rendered between the age of the O.T. and that of the N.T.; on the other hand, the term rendered 'oblation' in the O.T. lies behind the Greek of the N.T. in certain passages, but the identity is obscured for the

English reader in consequence of inconsistency in the translation into English as between the two Testaments, or of failure to read the Greek Testament in the light of Jewish ideas and terminology; (4) the absence of 'oblation' from the A.V. and R.V. of the N.T. is offset by the fact that 'gift' is relatively much more frequent in the N.T. than in the O.T. as a term to cover what was presented at the altar. A careful consideration of what is involved in (3) and (4) would show that either 'gift' should be substituted for 'oblation' in the great majority of the occurrences of the word in the R.V. of the O.T. or 'oblation' should be substituted for 'gift' in such a passage as, 'Therefore if thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee: leave there thy gift before the altar, go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift.'[1]

Of the use of the word 'gift' in E.V. it is unnecessary to say anything further at present; but the use of 'offering' must be further considered. This term occurs in the E.V. with great frequency, and most often as a part of the rendering of Hebrew terms which do not etymologically or directly express the idea of offering. The Hebrew terms in question are *specific* terms, terms for sacrifices or sacred offerings offered in some particular manner, or on some particular occasion or for some particular purpose.

According as the whole or only a part of what was brought to the altar was burnt on the altar, sacred gifts or sacrifices were termed עלה, *'ôlāh*, or זבח, *zebaḥ*. The first of these terms the E.V. regularly renders by *burnt-offering*, and the synonymous כליל[2] by *whole burnt-offering*, the second by *sacrifice*. But for this second term there are synonyms: a comprehensive, frequently recurring term for victims of which parts only were burnt on the altar, the remainder being used for sacred meals, is שלמים, *sh'lāmīm*, which E.V. regularly renders *peace-offerings*, occasionally[3] giving *thank-offering* in the margin as an alternative rendering.[4] These 'sacrifices' or 'peace-offerings' are

[1] Mt. $5^{23, 24}$.

[2] Lev. $6^{15\,f.}$ (E.V.$^{22\,f.}$), Dt. $13^{17}$ (E.V.$^{16}$), $33^{10}$, 1 Sam. $7^{9}$, Ps. $51^{21}$ (E.V. $^{19}$).

[3] So Lev. $3^{1}$ A.V., Ezek. $45^{15}$.

[4] So Lev. $3^{1}$ R.V.

subdivided in P into what the E.V. calls thank-offerings, vows, and free-will offerings. So again in P these appear not as subdivisions indeed of the burnt-offerings, but resembling them and differing from the peace-offerings in that they are wholly withdrawn from the offerer so that he does not partake of their flesh, what the E.V. calls sin-offerings and guilt-offerings. There are other terms also, such as those for special parts of the sacred gifts or sacrifices, or for sacrifices offered at particular seasons, which contain in English the term 'offering': such are the 'continual offering', the 'heave-offering', the 'wave-offering', the 'drink-offering'—the terms we have to examine. The question now is: how far is the idea of gift, which is suggested by the use of 'offering' in most of these English terms, expressed by any of the Hebrew terms thus rendered?

One of these terms, however, even in English, does not immediately suggest gift. That is 'sacrifice'. Just as little does the Hebrew זבח suggest gift. From some points of view, 'sacrifice' is a very inconvenient rendering of זבח. I proceed to explain this. In all discussions of Hebrew sacrifice the question arises as to the range of the term; should it, for example, include all gifts at the altar or only animal victims presented at the altar; and again, should it include certain ceremonial slayings of animals which had not been presented at the altar? But it is never suggested that the term 'sacrifice' should be so limited as to *exclude* such important victims as those used for burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and guilt-offerings; yet this is what the term 'sacrifice' as used in the English versions implicitly does. On a certain theory of the origin of sacrifice, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and guilt-offerings are, indeed, further removed from the original character of sacrifice than are זבחים; but even if on this ground it seemed well so to revolutionize our terminology of sacrifice as to exclude from it the types just mentioned, the English rendering would remain inexcusable, for the Hebrew term זבח does not in any sense correspond to sacrifice so understood, it means simply 'what is slain'. If from the Hebrew point of view it is found suitable to comprehend עלת and זבחים alike under the general head of sacred *offerings*, then a suitable translation of זבחים of the same type as 'burnt-offering' would be 'slain-offering'. The זבחים were slain animals used mainly

or a sacred meal, the עלת were offerings burnt whole on the altar.

We turn now to the other terms. On one theory of its etymology the term שלמים, the synonym of זבחים (E.V. sacrifices), rendered in R.V. 'peace-offerings', originally meant *payments*, a meaning which would be closely connected and easily derived from the idea of gift. This sense of payment was probably sometimes, whether rightly or wrongly, felt to be expressed by the term, as for example by the author of Prov. $7^{14}$, זבחי שלמים עלי היום שלמתי נדרי. By others it is not the idea of payment but other ideas that are associated with it (e.g. Greek *εἰρηνικά*). But with a single possible exception, נדבה, what is spontaneous or voluntary, none of these Hebrew *specific* terms either owes its origin to, or expresses, the sense of gift. For example the עלה like the זבח is derived from a special feature in the treatment of the victim; according to the commonly accepted etymology it is literally *the ascender*, what goes up on to the altar, or what goes up from the altar in smoke. Even if we connect the term not with the familiar Hebrew and Semitic root עלה 'to go up', but with the root غلى, the sense is not greatly different, though it is perhaps more directly expressed: it is then what is burnt.[1] If we wish to avoid introducing the idea of offering into the translation, we cannot do better than adopt from the Greek version and the Vulgate the rendering *holocaust*, of which the latter part is actually expressed by עלה and the first by the alternative term כליל, *whole* offering. And so with the remaining terms: it is the first part of the English compound expressions 'sin-offering', 'guilt-offering', 'thank-offering', 'free-will offering', &c., that is alone really expressed by the Hebrew; it is not because these victims were *given* to God that they received these names; they were so called because, gifts or whatever else they were, they had some relation, which we do not at present more closely define, to sin, guilt, thanks, and spontaneity respectively.

It would be tedious, and it is also unnecessary, to enter into further details with regard to these and other specific terms which do not in themselves express the idea of gift or offering; sufficient has been said to indicate how large a deduction must

[1] Hommel, *AHT* 278-9, but غلى is 'to *boil*' rather than 'to burn'.

be made from the use of the term 'offering' in compound expressions in the R.V. in estimating the way in which the belief that sacrifices were gifts has affected Hebrew terminology.

I pass to terms, some of which certainly, others of which possibly, express directly the ideas of gift, present, offering. And I remark at once that these terms are different in character: the terms I have just been discussing are specific; they are the names of special classes or applications of sacrifices or whatever we find it best to call them; the terms to which I pass now are generic, terms for the entire kind of which the terms already considered form classes or sub-classes.

Of these generic terms I propose to speak of four: אשה, קרשים, מנחה, קרבן, of which the two former do not but the two latter do directly express the idea of gift. All four terms are wide, but they are not co-extensive, still less, however, are they mutually exclusive. I have already pointed out that זבחים which is commonly translated 'sacrifices' does not really correspond to any meaning commonly placed on that word: the Hebrew זבחים is a much narrower term than 'sacrifice' and designates merely a special class of sacrifices. Among the four general terms just quoted, that which most nearly corresponds etymologically, and indeed in the idea which it continued to express, to 'sacrifice', is קרשים, *sacra*, sacred or holy (things). But this term is of course as much wider than sacrifices (as commonly understood) as זבחים is narrower. Nevertheless in certain connexions it is used with so much tacit restriction that it would be tolerably correct to render it *sacred* (*gifts*) or *sacred* (*offerings*): in other words it is in these cases a comprehensive term for all sacrifices or sacred gifts. In Num. $5^9$, for example, the restriction is definitely stated: 'Every contribution, even all the קרשים (sacred gifts), which they present to the priest, shall be his' (not R.V.), and so probably in the following verse. So without the restrictive clause in Num. $18^8$: 'I have given unto thee (i.e. Aaron and the priesthood) that which is kept (i.e. from being burnt on the altar) of the contribution made to me, even all the holy gifts'; then in the remainder of the chapter follow the various classes of *sacra*, which include not only animal victims, and not only vegetable offerings of which some part was burnt on the altar, but also such gifts as tithes none of which came to the altar.

It may be added that a more or less corresponding use of קדשים is found in later Hebrew; in the Mishna the sixth division is termed קדשים, and includes the tracts that deal with the various offerings; while two of these tracts passed at one time under the names respectively of שחיטת ק׳ and שחיטת חלין, i.e. the slaughter of the *sacra* and the slaughter of the profane; these dealt the one with the slaughter of animals devoted to the altar, and the other with the slaughter of animals intended for ordinary, common consumption.

We need not pursue this rather evasive use of קדשים further; it is well to have it in mind in considering how far Hebrew has an equivalent for 'sacrifice' and by what shifts it makes up for the lack of any complete equivalent, and the significance of this incomplete correspondence between the English and Hebrew views of our subject.

If we neglect etymology and consider only the range of objects covered by the ordinarily restricted use of the English term 'sacrifices', we may find perhaps the nearest equivalent in the word אִשֶּׁה, אִשִּׁים, which is regularly rendered in the R.V. by the compound expression offering-made-by-fire (A.V. occasionally sacrifice-made-by-fire). As usual with these compound expressions of the English Version, the idea of offering is certainly not conveyed by the word; on the other hand, that the object so termed was burnt with fire, i.e. of course the altar fire, may be expressed by the etymology of the word, and certainly corresponds to the actual treatment such objects underwent. If then by sacrifice is to be understood that of which the whole or a part is consumed on the altar, the English 'sacrifice' and the Hebrew אשה are almost exactly co-extensive. It is, indeed, sometimes said that the term is also used in the case of the shewbread (Lev. $24^{7,9}$) of an offering not consumed in the fire.[1] But this is incorrect.[2] It is to be remembered that אשה is used

[1] Paterson in *DB* (Art. Sacrifice).

[2] The term is really used with reference to the shewbread in precisely the same way as, for example, in reference to the peace-offerings. Of these last, part was consumed in the fire, part fell to the priest, and part furnished the offerer with his sacred meal. Yet the entire peace-offerings are included under אשים in Lev. $7^{35}$ (cp. v. 37) where, too, the very phrasing implies that part of the אשים in general fell to the priests for their use.

not only of the actual material burnt in the fire, but of the whole sacrifice of which a *part* is so burnt. So e. g. in Lev. $7^{35}$. This is the share of Aaron and the share of his sons out of the offerings made by fire to Yahweh; and even more clearly does this appear in Dt. $18^{1}$ where it is prescribed that the priests 'shall eat the fire-offerings of Yahweh and his inheritance', i. e. other sacred gifts of which no portion came to the altar fire, for here 'to eat the fire-offerings' can only mean to eat certain parts of offerings of which certain other parts are burnt on the altar. Now the shewbread offering consists of two parts: (1) the twelve loaves or cakes of bread, and (2) frankincense. So much is clearly stated in Leviticus[1]; the rest may be stated in the somewhat more explicit terms of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. $10^{7}$): Out of the common charges there is baked bread without leaven: two heaps of this were baked: they were baked the day before the Sabbath, but were brought into the holy place on the morning of the Sabbath, and this is set upon the holy table in two heaps, each containing six loaves, one against another, with two golden cups full of frankincense set upon them. They remained till another Sabbath, and then other loaves were brought in their stead; the loaves were given to the priests for food, the frankincense was sacrificially burnt (*θυμιωμένου*) on the sacred fire on which also all (other sacrificial portions) were consumed with fire (*ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ὁλοκαυτοῦσι τὰ πάντα*). In brief, the bread part of the shewbread offering went to the priests, the frankincense part of it to the same fire on the altar of burnt-offering in which whole offerings were burnt entire and other offerings were burnt in part.

Whatever the etymology of the term, whatever precise idea it called up in the mind of the writers or translators of the O.T., what the term covered is clear: it was any sacrifice or offering of which part or the whole was consumed in the altar fire. What, however, was the etymology, under what particular aspect did the term bring the offerings in question before those who read or heard it?

The usually accepted and, from the point of view of Hebrew,

[1] Cf. the implication of the Mishna note (Men. $3^{6}$) זה שני סדרים מעכבין זה את זה שני בזיכין מעכבין זה את זה הסדרים והבזיכין מעכבין זה את זה.

the most obvious is on the whole the most probable etymology; אשה is a derivative from אש, fire. The alternative etymology is in some respects attractive; and if the usage in Hebrew were different from what it is, might be regarded as fairly probable. According to this etymology the word is from the root אנש = Ar. أنس. From this root Hebrew derives אנשים, the plural of איש, man, possibly also נשים, and Arabic the corresponding noun. But apart from אנשים, possibly also נשים, women, perhaps אנוש and the word אשה itself, the root in entirely unknown in Hebrew. In Arabic, on the other hand, it occurs frequently, and among the common meanings of the verb is *to be sociable*, *friendly*. It is not certain, indeed, whether the ordinary meaning of the noun was derived from this, so that man is the sociable, friendly being, or whether the verbal meaning was derivative from the meaning *man*, friendliness, sociability being regarded as a pre-eminently human characteristic. This uncertainty needs to be allowed for when estimating the probability that the Hebrew אשה is derived from this root. If, however, in early Semitic the verb meant as it does in Arabic 'to be sociable', 'friendly', an *ancient* Hebrew or Semitic term אשה might mean *a means*, whether by gift or otherwise, *for establishing friendly relations*; and if the term originally had a sacred application it would mean: a means for establishing friendly relations between man and God; and if we need a less cumbrous equivalent and one of the pattern familiar to us from the English Versions, we might find it in such a term as *fellowship-offering*.

The possibility that אשה *originally* meant *fellowship-offering* is interesting when we are considering the earliest, shall we say the prehistoric Hebrew, theory or conception of sacrifice. But I think it may safely be asserted that, whatever the etymology, *fellowship-offering* is not the meaning that was present to the mind of the writer or reader of any passage in the O.T. where the word occurs. The earliest occurrence in the O.T. is in Dt. $18^{1}$ already cited; it occurs in two other Deuteronomic or later passages (1 Sam. $2^{28}$, Jos. $13^{14}$—not in LXX) and over sixty times in the Priestly Code. In view of this usage אשה may very well be a somewhat later creation, though the possibility that it is very much older than its first occurrence

in extant literature cannot be excluded. Yet even so it must be recalled that the root אנש *to be sociable* appears to have been for long obsolete in Hebrew except in the noun אנשים, men, in which the sense of friendliness if ever present had almost certainly become so dim as to be imperceptible. Thus of any positive trace of this meaning being conveyed by אשה there is none.

On the other hand, almost whenever the word appears in Hebrew literature we can detect the association, whether etymologically justifiable or not, with a fire. For in view of the frequent association of אשה with burning, with the creation of a soothing savour[1] and so forth, it is provable that the author of the Levitical laws felt the association of אשה and אש—the same of course cannot be asserted, though it may be true of Dt. 18[1]—and even if this be not admitted we can clearly trace this association of ideas once at least in the LXX, possibly less clearly in the majority of the LXX renderings. The clear example is in 1 Sam. 2[28], where כל אשי is rendered *τὰ πάντα τοῦ πυρός*. For the rest there is considerable variety of rendering: seven times אשה is rendered by *ὁλοκαύτωμα*, the word which is commonly used as an equivalent for the עלה which was wholly consumed on the altar, and more than twenty times, i.e. more than half the times that the word occurs in the O.T., it is rendered by *κάρπωμα*. Etymologically this word should mean a fruit-offering; but Deissmann[2] has shown that as a matter of fact in the Greek version, as in certain Greek inscriptions, *καρπόω* meant *to burn* ceremonially; whence it would follow that *κάρπωμα* may have very closely corresponded to the meaning *offering made by fire*, and in favour of this is the fact that the only other Hebrew word rendered by *κάρπωμα* in the LXX is עלה. But even if the connexion with fire was very strongly felt in *κάρπωμα*, we have to note finally that eight times the word אשה is rendered by the much more colourless term *θυσία*. In the Greek version, then, the association with fire, though frequently, is not invariably expressed. And when we pass to later versions it disappears altogether; in the Syriac it is

[1] e.g. Num. 15[3] ועשיתם אשה ליי עלה או זבח . . . לעשות ריח ניחח ליי.

[2] *Bible Studies*, 138.

consistently rendered by ܩܘܪܒܢܐ, in the Targum by קרבן, *ḳorbān*.

Briefly then we may put the history of אשה thus: it may possibly at a remote period have sprung out of the idea that friendly relations needed to be and could be established with God; but if it had ever had this meaning it lost it, became colourless and attracted to itself a connexion with fire; or it originated in this connexion with fire; in either case it gradually lost this significance and had become a somewhat vague sacrificial term to the Jews of the first century A.D. or thereabouts, and as such suggested that idea of gift which, as we shall see, was then prominent.

There remain for consideration the two general terms which express the meaning offering or gift, viz. מנחה and קרבן. Both these terms have a wider reference than אשה; קרבן, and in certain connexions מנחה, are more restricted than the vague, general term קרשים. מנחה was itself, or is identical in form with a word, which was in frequent use especially in the earlier literature, but also in the later, not only for sacred gifts, but also for gifts in ordinary life or especially as from subjects to kings. קרבן on the other hand is a term which first occurs in Hebrew literature in Ezekiel, is then used very frequently in P, but does not occur elsewhere in the O.T. except in Neh. $10^{35}$, $13^{31}$, where the MT differentiates the punctuation (קָרְבָּן: cf. Syr. ܩܘܪܒܢܐ). On the other hand, it plays a prominent part in post-Biblical Hebrew and Syriac, and even appears in Arabic, for in the Koran it is used, for example, of the offerings of Cain and Abel. There is one other point of contrast to be observed between מנחה and קרבן: so far as *Biblical* usage is concerned, קרבן is a technical religious or ritual term; it is never used of other than sacred gifts. On the other hand, this restriction does not hold good in Aramaic; in Syriac ܩܘܪܒܢܐ is also used of gifts as between man and man, or of tribute paid to a king.

In considering the bearing of terms on current ideas, the actual usage of any given period, if it can be adequately determined, is far more important than etymology. The significance of the terms מנחה and קרבן for Hebrew and Jewish conceptions of sacrifice have perhaps been somewhat obscured from neglect

of this consideration. Certainly the etymology deserves attention, and is suggestive. But the extent to which the original etymological meaning maintains itself needs to be constantly checked. From this point of view I turn first to a closer examination of מנחה, the word used of the offerings of Cain and Abel, of the offerings of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, of the vain 'oblations' denounced by Isaiah ($1^{13}$), and in the words of David, 'If it be the Lord that hath stirred thee up against me, let him smell an offering' (1 Sam. $26^{19}$), and in a number of references to a more or less wide class of sacrifices or sacred gifts.

The etymology of this word that has been commonly accepted would give it as its original meaning *gift*; it is said to be from the root מנח, which is otherwise unknown in Hebrew, but in Arabic gives the verb *manaḥa*, and among others the noun *minḥat*, which corresponds exactly in form, and partially in meaning, to the Hebrew מנחה. In view of the dispute which has arisen as to the etymology of the Hebrew term, and the importance that has been attached to its use in its bearing on Hebrew sacrificial conceptions, it will be well to have the Arabic usage rather more fully before us than Hebrew dictionaries, Old Testament Theologies, and the like commonly give it. The verb *manaḥa* means (1) to lend a she-camel or a sheep or a goat to some one that he may have its milk, and then return the animal after a certain period; according to Arabic lexicographers this is the original meaning[1]; (2) to lend a she-camel to some one, assigning to him her soft hair, milk, and offspring; (3) to lend some one a piece of land that he might cultivate it and have the produce of it; (4) to give some one something as a free gift. The normal modifications of this last meaning are found in conjugations iii, viii, x. Similarly the noun *minḥat* has a variety of meanings: (1) a loan of a camel for purposes already described; (2) a gift of milk; (3) a ewe or she-camel lent for its milk; (4) a gift.

The theory of Arabic lexicographers that the giving of the usufruct of a camel for a specific purpose is the original meaning of the root has in its favour that the camel has always played

[1] Not, therefore, to loan a thing, but to give the usufruct of a thing. Cp. Jacob *Leben der vorislamischen Araber*, 66.

so extraordinarily an important part in Arabic life, and a large number of Arabic words certainly do appear to originate with specific references to the camel. If this be so, the sense of a free and complete gift which attaches to the Hebrew *minḥah* is derivative and not so immediately radical as many references to the subject suggest. Finally, a negative point should be noted; in Arabic the root, whether as verb or noun, is not used of sacred gifts. So much for the generally accepted derivation.

An alternative etymology was proposed centuries ago by Abu-l-walid, was criticized by Ḳimḥi, dropped out of view, and has of late been revived, partly on the ground of fresh evidence. According to this theory מנחה is from the root נחה, meaning *to lead*, *guide*, and would therefore have meant originally *something led*, and when the word received a ritual force, something led to the altar, with which the Arabic هديّة from هدى *to guide*, *lead*, used of a gift or victim led to Mecca has been compared. The new evidence which has influenced some in accepting this etymology is a South Arabian inscription in which a woman is said *tanaḥḥayat wa-tanadhdhaṟan*, which we may render provisionally, presented offering and vow to the Lord of the house of her God. The same inscription contains the term *ḥaṭṭa'at*, sin-offering. The essential point is that *tanaḥḥayat*, a form of the same root as the Hebrew נחה, is used in this early Arabic (Nabataean) inscription with a ritual meaning. From this Hommel[1] draws the conclusion that the Hebrew *minḥah*, used of a sacrifice or offering, and the Hebrew *minḥah*, meaning a gift, are *etymologically* of different origin, the one being from the root נחה, the other presumably, though Hommel does not definitely state this, from the root מנח. Others infer that מנחה in all its senses was derived from the root נחה.

Now with regard to these etymological facts and theories, two observations need to be made: (1) even if the more commonly accepted theory be correct and מנחה is derived from a Semitic root of which the fundamental meaning was *to give*, from this fact *alone* no conclusion follows as to the early *Semitic* conception of sacrifice; we cannot argue because *minḥah* is derived

[1] *AHT* 322, n. 1.

from a root meaning to give, therefore the early *Semites* looked upon sacrifice as a gift; we must first get evidence of the ritual application of the term; and our earliest evidence of this is in Hebrew literature. This we can say: if מנחה meant gift to the Hebrews, then at the date of the earliest Hebrew literature the *Hebrews* looked on sacrifices as gifts, for in the earliest Hebrew literature מנחה is so applied. But (2) even if it was derived from the root נחה *to lead*, its significance for the *Hebrew* conception of sacrifice remains unaffected, if it can be shown that in early Hebrew literature it had already developed from its etymological sense of something *led* into something *given*. Here I will pursue this point by reference to Dr. Skinner's comment on the term as used in the story of Cain and Abel. He first states the point, as it seems to me, admirably 'מנחה lit. a present or tribute: the use of this word shows that the "gift" theory of sacrifice was fully established in the age when the narrative originated'.[1] He then in a note refers to the Arabic *manaḥa*, to give, and then in a foot-note to this refers to the theory that the root is not *manaḥa*, to give, but נחה *to direct*, and adds, 'If this be correct, what was said above about the "gift theory" would fall to the ground.' Here Dr. Skinner seems to me to allow far too great weight to etymology as against usage. As to usage, we may say this: (1) the existence in the earliest Hebrew literature of a word מנחה expressing the ideas of gift and tribute is indisputable, whatever its etymology may have been; it is used, for example, of Jacob's present to Esau and Israel's early present or tribute to Eglon, king of Moab; (2) this being the case we have certainly to reckon with the possibility, not to say the probability, that the sacrificial term מנחה, even if it were etymologically and originally distinct from the term מנחה that quite clearly meant gift or tribute, became gradually and had become by the time of the earliest Hebrew literature fully charged with the meaning of this possibly etymologically distinct term; (3) there is no evidence that any connexion with נחה *to lead* was ever felt when מנחה was used as a sacrificial term; מנחה, for instance, is never used as an accusative to נחה as it might well have been had the connexion of מנחה with נחה been felt; and the verb נחה is never in Hebrew

[1] [*Genesis*, pp. 103 f.]

used with any sacrificial reference, but the verbs used are הביא, הגיש, הקריב, הוביל, נשא[1], cf. Lex. 585 b; (4) the same *idioms* occur for offering a מנחה to Yahweh and a מנחה to a human subject; for example, exactly the same idiom is used of Cain's offering and of the refusal of tribute, taxes, or the like to Saul: ויבא קין . . . מנחה ליי (Gen. $4^3$), ויבזהו ולא הביאו לו מנחה (1 Sam. $10^{27}$). Again the same idiom (הגיש מנחה, different from that just last cited) is used in 1 Ki. $5^1$ (E.V. $4^{21}$): they (i.e. the kings) brought *minḥah* and served Solomon, and in Am. $5^{25}$, Did ye bring *minḥah* unto me (i.e. to Yahweh) forty years in the wilderness?; (5) even after the ritual meaning of מנחה had become narrowed down to an offering of cereals, the sense of gift when the term occurred with sacrificial reference occasionally made itself felt; for though the LXX when מנחה has its wider sacrificial reference renders by *θυσία*, occasionally it renders by *δῶρον* (so of Abel's sacrifice).

When due weight is given to all these considerations it seems to me hazardous to deny that מנחה in the earliest Hebrew literature meant (sacrificial) *gift*; whatever its etymology and its exact original meaning, by the eighth or ninth century to the Hebrew mind it called up the idea of gift as well when it was used of what was brought to God as when it was used of what was brought to kings.

As מנחה in the earlier, so is קרבן in the later literature a general term for sacrifices and sacred gifts. With regard to this term, too, there has been some etymological discussion. Is it a Hebrew creation, or was it borrowed from Assyrian or Aramaic? It is not necessary for our purpose to determine this question, nor would it much affect the discussion if Haupt's theory that the root is כרב = ברך [2] were correct and not, as appears to be the case, untenable. The root in all probability is קרב, which occurs in Assyrian, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic with similar, though not in all these languages with exactly the same range of meanings. It is commonly said that etymologically קרבן means 'something brought near'; and so it does in the same way that the English word 'present' means 'something brought into the presence of some one'; but the Hebrew קרבן and the English

[1] [Also עשה, העלה, הקטיר.]

[2] Note in Paterson's *Numbers* (*SBOT*), p. 46.

'present' both actually mean more than this: קרבן signifies something brought near to a person and offered to him for his acceptance; in other words a present or gift. The corresponding sense of giving or presenting goes back in the verb to the earliest Hebrew literature. We may note the parallelism of הקריב and נתן in Jud. $5^{25}$, where A.V. renders הקריב erroneously by *brought forth*, which the R.V. inadequately corrects by simply omitting *forth*: we must rather render with Dr. Cooke[1]

> Water he asked, milk she gave;
> In a bowl fit for nobles she offered him curd.

Cp. also Jud. $3^{17}$, Ps. $72^{10}$ (E.V. correctly, offer).

It is probable, therefore, that from the first קרבן conveyed the full meaning 'present' or 'gift'; and since *in Hebrew* it is united to a religious usage it acquires the specific sense of a gift to God (cp. the English *oblation*). That this force of gift, a gift to God, was clearly recognized and felt from the third century B.C. onwards, we have abundant proof. In the LXX קרבן is *invariably* rendered by *δῶρον*, and the equivalence occurs nearly eighty times. The absolute consistency of the rendering contrasted with the variability in the rendering of other terms such as אשה, is significant; and the fact that *προσφορὰ* is never used is worth noting, since had the assumed etymological sense 'something brought near', maintained itself, *προσφορὰ* would have been a better equivalent than *δῶρον*. Twice at least Josephus interprets קרבן by *δῶρον* (*Ant.* IV. iv. 4), or *δῶρον θεοῦ* (*C. Ap.* I. xxii. 4). And we have the same interpretation in the well-known reference to קרבן in Mk. $7^{11}$: *κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστι δῶρον ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς*; Moffatt badly: 'this money might have been at your service but it is Ḳorban (i.e. dedicated to God)'. In the light of this we must read some other references to gifts in the N.T.: to Mt. $5^{23\,f.}$ I have already referred; in that passage we may infer with certainty that the word used by our Lord and rendered in the Greek by *δῶρον* was קרבן, and the same is true of the saying in Mt. $23^{18}$ about the gift and the altar that sanctifies the gift. Whether *τὸ δῶρον* in Mt. $8^{4}$ corresponds to a קרבן in the original saying is however doubtful, for instead of *τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξε* Mk. $1^{44}$ has simply *ἃ*

[1] *Song of Deborah.*

προσέταξε. But if the δῶρον of Mt. is in this passage *interpretation*, it is a very significant interpretation, not indeed for the sense of קרבן but for the vitality of the theory that sacrifices were gifts. For δῶρον, the gift which the leper had to offer, consisted of a guilt-offering, a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and the accessory meal-offerings. In all the passages from Matthew just cited, the Peshitta and old Syriac, it should be added, render the Greek δῶρον by ܩܘܪܒܢܐ. As Ḳorbān is translated by terms meaning gifts, so in turn Greek terms for gift are rendered by Ḳorban. Thus along several lines we see how strongly the sense of gift in קרבן was felt.

In a few words it is now possible to bring together the chief suggestions offered by the terminology of sacrifice. The terms in question are general and specific. The specific terms are very largely represented in the English Versions by some compound expression such as 'burnt-offering', containing the word 'offering'; but the idea of offering is not directly conveyed by any of the special terms, largely, as we may now hold, because the Hebrew language does not create compound words; the special terms for sacrifices and the like have for the most part reference to the treatment of the object, whether it was slain simply or also burnt, whether it was waved or separated from a larger mass, to the occasion on which it was offered, as in the term daily offering, or to a state, such as that of guilt, in reference to which the sacrifice was offered. With one or two possible but scarcely probable exceptions, none of these terms, or of the general terms, stand related to the ideas of communion or fellowship. On the other hand, of the generic terms two certainly express the idea of gift; one of these runs back to the earliest Hebrew extant literature; ultimately this term becomes specific, creating the need for a new general term to cover all sacrifices and sacred gifts; this need was met, say in the sixth century B.C., by creating or borrowing another term; this new general term also meant 'gift' and continued in use, the sense of gift being strongly felt, down to and even after the time when Jewish sacrifice ceased to be offered. But if the general terms clearly mean gifts, though the special terms do not express that idea, they also all refer to what the Jews, as the general terms show, nevertheless regarded as gifts. More-

over, the creation of a fresh general term expressing the sense of gift at a relatively late period shows the vitality of the idea, which in turn was nourished by the use of a term that to the last carried its meaning on the surface. Whenever in later times the Jew sacrificed, he was consciously intending his sacrifice to be a gift to God. How it was received or used by the recipient, with what purpose it was given, are questions yet to be considered.

# II

## SACRIFICE AND SACRED OFFERINGS

### ii

In the last lecture I examined the extent to which what is called the gift theory of sacrifice had impressed itself on Hebrew terminology. I have now in further examination of the Hebrew theory and practice of sacred gifts to consider (1) the range of Hebrew sacred gifts, (2) the relation of these to the altar, and (3) the practice of commutation.

Sacred gifts consisted not exclusively, but predominantly, of food and food-material, of animals and vegetables, especially cereals. These gifts were given by men and received by God. But how was the reception of the gift by God conceived, what use was he thought to make of the food that was given him, of food which even in P God is represented as calling 'my food' (Num. $28^2$, &c.)?

The great predominance of food in the sacred gifts even of later times may be traced back to an early stage of thought when the god was conceived as actually consuming human food. How far and how long this gross view survived in Hebrew popular thought it is difficult to say. In repudiating it, does the author of Ps. 50, which like other Asaphite Psalms is scarcely among the earliest, imply a belief that some of his *Jewish* contemporaries actually believed that Yahweh ate the flesh of bulls and drank the blood of goats, as the later author of the additions to Daniel certainly believed that the worshippers of Bel considered that Bel consumed the large quantities of meat, meal, and wine nightly placed upon his table? The authors of certain earlier passages in Hebrew literature seem themselves to express, or at least to be in close touch with an age that held, the belief that the god of the Hebrews like other gods derived sensuous pleasure from the food that was

offered to him, that like men he was made merry by wine, and that if he did not actually eat the flesh of the sacrifices, he yet smelt with satisfaction the fumes of the burning flesh? The Yahwist narrates that Yahweh smelt the soothing savour of Noah's burnt-offerings, Gen. $8^{21}$ (cp. the repudiations in Lev. $26^{31}$, Am. $5^{21}$), David in 1 Sam. $26^{19}$ is convinced that Yahweh smells the savour of sacred gifts, Jotham (Jud. $9^{13}$) that gods like men are made happy with wine. Even if it seemed safe to look upon the terms used even in these passages as not intended literally, if here as unquestionably in later literature such as Ezekiel and P the terms were merely petrified expressions preserving the forms of once living but long dead beliefs, yet the close relation of the narrative of Noah's burnt-offerings to the Babylonian story of the sensuous enjoyment by the gods of the fragrant incense burnt for them by Noah's Babylonian counterpart leaves us in no doubt in what belief the expressions arose: some of the gifts made to the gods were regarded as being most directly and materially accepted by them for their own sensuous enjoyment, and this belief accounts not only for expressions but also for ritual, that endured long after the belief had been abandoned by the Jews. How, if at all, the expressions and ritual were explained in later times we need not here inquire. We are in touch through them with sacrificial animal victims regarded as gifts to God.

But much larger parts of the sacred gifts were treated very differently: these, too, were certainly regarded as given by man and received by God, yet not for his own use and sensuous enjoyment, but as assigned by God to human representatives or proxies—the priests, the poor, perhaps to some extent the offerer himself—for the satisfaction of their appetite. In practice this meant that these gifts or parts of gifts were actually and directly received and made use of by special classes of men; whereas those parts of the gifts which were subject to ritual originating in the belief that the gods ate or smelt the savour of the sacrificial food were actually destroyed and used by no one.

1. *The range of Hebrew sacred gifts.* A comprehensive list of קדשים is given in Num. $18^{8-32}$; the materials of which the קרבנים consisted can be gathered principally from Lev. 1–7,

Num. 7 and 31. For the present purpose and under the reservations which I made in the last lecture, I will use *sacra* or 'sacred gifts' as the equivalent of קדשים, and 'presents' for קרבנים, rendering the cognate verb by 'present': instead, therefore, of the R.V. phrase 'offer an oblation', I shall say 'present a present'.

The first seven chapters of Leviticus may be regarded as a guide to the presents that men were allowed or required to give to Yahweh, and the manner of their presentation. 'If any one of you', the law in Leviticus begins, 'would or has to present a present unto Yahweh, the present you present may consist of a head of kine or sheep or goats' ($1^2$); and, later in the same chapter, among birds, doves and pigeons are allowed ($1^{14}$). Some or all of these may be presented under the various forms of burnt-offering ($1^3$), peace-offerings ($3^{1,6}$), sin-offerings ($4^{23\,f.,\ 28\,f.}$), guilt-offerings (Num. $18^9$). Presents of cereal food might consist of bread, which had to be unleavened if to be burnt on the altar, but might be, and under certain circumstances was, required to be leavened if presented at, but not burnt on, the altar (Lev. $2^{12}$, $23^{17}$). Or the cereals might be presented in the form of merely parched grain (Lev. $2^{14-16}$). What sacred presents might consist of is further shown by two of the narratives in P. Num. 7 contains a list of the קרבנים presented by the tribal princes: these consist of heavy silver dishes and bowls in addition to cereal and animal offerings; and Num. $31^{50}$ refers to a present presented by the officers in the successful battle against the Midianites in their turn: We have brought a present for Yahweh, each what he has got, a golden ornament, an armlet or a bracelet, a finger-ring, an ear-ring, or a necklace, to make propitiation for ourselves before Yahweh.

We can fill out this list by reference to the list in Num. 18 of obligatory or conditionally obligatory sacred gifts of the children of Israel which, according to the theory of this chapter, passed over as dues to the priests, to whom they certainly seem to have been paid in later Jewish practice. The *ḥerem*, or the devoted thing, of this chapter (Num. $18^{14}$) may correspond in material, at least in part, to such presents as those of the princes at the dedication of the Temple, of the officers after the Midianite war. But the term is, in the context, vague. The two chief

additional materials of sacred gifts brought under our notice in this chapter are included under the references to the first-born, and to first-fruits. Under the first-born are included not only kine, sheep, goats, which we have already seen could be presented to Yahweh, but also the first-born of all animals owned by the Israelites and the first-born of men. The various methods of giving different classes of the first-born to God, I come to later. The presentation, however, of these first-born of men, or the first-born of domestic animals other than kine, sheep, or goats, was no longer made direct at the time of this law but by means of redemption; what was actually given to Yahweh was not the first-born, but a fixed sum of money per head. That is one important development to keep in view. At an earlier date there were alternative methods of redemption in the case of unclean animals, but neither consisted of a money payment: Yahweh had a right to the first-born of all animals owned by the Israelites, and consequently to that of the ass[1] which was early domesticated, but the ass as being unclean could not be presented to Yahweh in the form of an offering of which portions should be burnt on the altar and the rest eaten. The early law (Ex. $13^{13}$, J) allows these two alternatives: either the ass may be redeemed by a young sheep or goat, which would be presented to Yahweh in the normal manner; or the ass is put out of existence by having its neck broken; it is thus removed from the use of men even though its presentation to Yahweh cannot be completed in the same way as that of a clean animal. This also is a detail to which we shall have occasion to return.

The materials covered by the terms first-fruits (ראשית and בכרים) need a little more detailed consideration. The vegetable offerings that definitely and directly occur under the term קרבן are cereals; but the vegetable presents made to Yahweh were in reality a much wider class; they are referred to in the list of תרומה in Num. 18 f., and were in themselves of much earlier origin than this priestly list; nor need we doubt that the further

[1] The ass is obviously merely cited as a typical instance; at a later date Philo specifies as additional examples horses and camels (*De Praem. Sac.* i, Yonge, iii. 205).

details first in some cases directly attested in the Mishnah are some of them at least of early origin. The relevant clauses in Num. 18 are these: All the fat, i.e. the best, of the new oil, wine, and corn, even the *reshith*[1] of them, which they give to Yahweh, to him (i.e. Aaron = the priesthood) have I given them. The first-fruits (בכרים) of whatsoever is in their land which they shall bring unto Yahweh shall be thine (the priest's). The tithe of the children of Israel which they contribute to Yahweh I have given to the Levites (Num. $18^{12, 13, 24}$). Incidentally we can gather from the O.T. some details as to the range of vegetable produce covered by these laws; for example, from Lev. $2^{12}$ and 2 Chron. $31^{4f.}$ we learn that ראשית included honey. But it is to the Mishnah that we turn for further details; and here a distinction, that is probably important for the history of these gifts, is drawn: בכרים, first-fruits, were given *only* of wheat, barley, vines, fig-trees, pomegranates, oil, and honey (*Numbers*, p. 228), whereas tithe and another form of gift or sacred due as we may really rather regard it was levied on all vegetable produce, the Mishnah specifying such things as cucumbers, melons, and onions, while from the Gospels we know that, by the scrupulous, tithe was given of even herbs. The different methods of presenting these vegetable gifts and possible differences of origin will fall for consideration later. The materials of which Hebrew and Jewish sacred gifts consisted are now sufficiently before us for us to resume the inquiry as to the extent to which the idea of gift dominated the motive of making these presentations and some of the reactions of this idea on Jewish religious conceptions and practice.

2. *Relation of sacred gifts to the Altar.* I propose to examine certain differences that appear within the category of sacred gifts and to refer to one or two rites that have a close relation to rites connected with some of these gifts, though not themselves rites associated with what is termed a sacred gift. Ultimately the determination of the differentia of sacrifice depends on a comparison of what lies outside Hebrew religion as well as of what lies within it; and even of my limited attempt here and now to examine that differentia

[1] Cf. Phoen. קדמת *CIS* $165^{12}$.

a comparison that has been made between the materials of Hebrew and Babylonian sacred gifts may form the starting-point.

It has been rather frequently asserted that honey was offered by the Babylonians whereas it was not merely not offered but forbidden to be offered among the Hebrews. So e. g. Jeremias in his article on 'Ritual' in E. Bi. (4124; cp. *ATAO*², 428), remarks, 'Honey, cream, milk, fruit occur frequently as Babylonian offerings, but never amongst those of the O.T.' This statement is certainly lacking in precision; it is true that Hebrew law forbade honey to be offered in a particular form of offering (Lev. $2^{11}$), but it commanded it to be offered in another (Lev. $2^{12}$), and the two laws stand side by side: 'No cereal offering, which ye shall present (תקריבו) to Yahweh, shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn (תקטירו) no leaven, nor any honey, as an offering-made-by-fire unto Yahweh. As a present of first-fruits (ראשית) ye shall present them unto Yahweh but upon his altar they may not come up as a soothing savour' (cp. 2 Chron. $31^{5}$). In Hebrew terminology both forms of offering, that in which honey might be included, and that in which it might not, are קרבנים (with Lev. $2^{11}$ cp. v. 4); the form of קרבן from which honey was excluded was the אשה. Similarly, whereas leaven is forbidden in what is to be burned on the altar, it is definitely required in some other forms of offerings of which parts, including the leavened bread, were not burned on the altar. Thus if one offered a peace-offering of thanksgiving, in addition to the slain animal and unleavened cakes of three varieties, he was required to bring 'cakes of unleavened bread', and of this present (קרבן) of unleavened cakes one fell to the priest (all this according to Lev. $7^{11\,ff.}$), while the remainder of the unleavened cakes, according to the Mishnah (cp. Chapman, *Leviticus*, p. 37), were eaten by the offerer together with his portion of the sacrificial flesh. So again according to Lev. $23^{20}$ the two cakes made of the new grain and mixed with leaven which were presented at the Feast of Weeks were ceremonially waved before Yahweh, so becoming a תנופה 'wave-offering', and then fell to the priests.

Whether the exclusion of leaven and honey even from what was to be burned on the altar runs back to ancient Hebrew law or custom is not certain; such prohibition if it existed in the

ighth century, and Am. $4^5$ by no means clearly shows that t did, is shown by that same passage to have been at times nd by some disregarded.[1]

Having the actual laws relating to honey before us, and the imitations with which alone it is correct to say that Jewish law orbade honey to be offered, we can return to the comparison with Babylonian custom. Has the alleged difference any reality? If it has one, has it anything like as much as the terms in which the difference is asserted seem to suggest? The question turns on another: had Babylonian ritual a corresponding distinction to the Jewish distinction between offerings which were burnt on the altar and offerings which were not? Some such distinction existed in Babylon, but the exact application of the distinction the sources do not seem to define. We may therefore better put our question thus: was honey ever burnt on the altar in Babylon? To which the answer, as I am informed, is that there is no evidence that honey ever was burnt on the altar, and that it is quite improbable that it was. The frequent references to honey in the inscriptions do not seem to imply that these offerings were offered to the Babylonian deities more materially than the shewbread was offered to Yahweh, or often than the first-fruits, which included honey. Thus honey appears in one of Nebuchadrezzar's inscriptions[2] as part of the Satûḳu; but the Satûḳu is defined by Delitzsch as 'the perpetual, regular Tempelabgaben, consisting of sacrificial animals, offerings in kind, gold, &c.', and according to some theories the etymological meaning of the word is *tax* (*KAT*$^3$, 596 n.). In one other part of the same inscription it is said indeed, 'with honey . . . I made the bath of Nebo and Nana to abound'; we may call honey here a sacrificial gift if we please, yet it is no more so than the shewbread of the Hebrews; there is no evidence to show that it was ever burnt on the altar or that it was not eaten, like the Hebrew shewbread and like the Hebrew cakes of leavened bread which formed the 'wave-offering', subsequently eaten by the priests. For offerings of honey (probably also not burnt) at Carthage see *CIS*, i. 166 (= C. 44) s.v. נפת.

[1] Cp. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, 203 n.

[2] [Cp. Langdon, *Die neubabylonische Königsinschriften*, p. 91.]

Honey, then, was made the material of sacred gifts alike in Babylon, Jerusalem, and Carthage. Whether in any or all of these religious centres this was also a sacrifice turns on what we determine to be the differentia of sacrifice. Is this to be found in mere presentation at the altar or in solemn laying of it out on the table of the god? Is it to be found in the deprivation of life, in which case no vegetable offering was a sacrifice—a distinction which Hebrew usage certainly does not favour? Is the differentia to be found in the destruction on the altar—of at least a part if not of the whole offering? The least differentia would I suppose consist in this, that a sacrifice is a gift presented with some ritual, whether that ritual be of the simplest kind such as mere presentation at the altar, or more elaborate and complicated.

What we have to do, then, is to take a broad survey of the classes into which Hebrew sacred gifts fall when classified according to the altar-ritual that accompanied them.

1. Certain gifts were made without ritual; these include not only money payments such as the half-shekel Temple tax, but the contributions in kind which were delivered direct to the priests or sacred classes without presentation at the altar; how far such contributions were made at an earlier period is not certain, but the Priestly Code provides for them, and the Mishnah more meticulously defines them. There was probably some change in the usage of terms which I have discussed elsewhere and must not linger to discuss afresh here; but in Num. 18 and Neh. 10 a distinction of phraseology is employed for certain contributions in kind of vegetables. The peculiarity in the phraseology may be in part due to the fact that the de-ritualizing of some of these gifts was recent or even in process at the time. It is probable that the ראשית which they give unto Yahweh (Num. $18^{12}$) and the tithes which they contribute (ירימו, A.V. offer) unto Yahweh (Num. $18^{24}$) were paid direct to the priests and Levites without ritual at the Temple, whereas the first ripe fruits which they *bring* unto Yahweh (Num. $18^{13}$) were presented with ritual before they fell to the priests. It is true the difference in the *verbs* 'give' and 'bring' would not necessarily suggest this; and all the verbs alike may go back to a stage when all these contributions were made with ritual. But the evidence

of an actual distinction in the mode of presentation is even clearer in Neh. 10, and is not only clear, but has become the subject of discussion in the Mishnah. In Neh. $10^{34-38}$ a distinction is drawn between the בכרים, v.[36] (R.V. v.[35], first-fruits), of the soil, which, like the firstlings (and these were certainly offered with ritual), one 'brought to the house of Yahweh', and the ראשית (R.V., v.[37] first-fruits) of dough (?) and certain vegetable contributions including wine and oil which were brought to the chambers (לשכות) of our God; i. e. the first class of contributions were brought to the Temple in order to undergo the prescribed ritual, the second class were brought to the priests' quarters round the Temple for the direct and immediate use of the priests. The Mishnah draws a clear distinction between tithes and תרומה (= 1/60 to 1/40) on the one hand, which were to be paid alike whether the Temple was standing or not, because requiring no altar ritual they could be so paid, and the בכרים on the other hand, which could only be offered while the Temple stood, for Temple and altar were alike requisite for the prescribed ritual (Bik. ii. 3).

2. The second class of sacred gifts consist of those which were presented at the altar, and thereafter, not burnt on the altar but given to the priest. The chief or only representative of this class is to be found in the first-fruits which were brought to the house of Yahweh as just described. The ritual prescribed for the presentation of these offerings in the seventh century B.C. is given in Dt. $26^{1-11}$, and has already been referred to; the ritual as prescribed later is described at greater length in Mishnah Tract Bikkurim (cp. *Numbers*, p. 228). If by sacrifice we mean merely an 'oblation at the altar' (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, p. 197), sacrifices, as distinct from simple sacred gifts or tributes, begin with this class; if sacrifice is to involve the destruction of something on the altar, then sacrifices begin with the next class, for the first-fruits offered according to the ritual of Dt. 26 and Bikkurim became, after presentation at the altar, the property of the priest—implicit in Dt., explicit in Bikkurim.

3. The third class of offerings consists of animals slain at the sanctuary and in part burnt on the altar; the remainder of the victim was consumed in part by the offerer and in part by the priest. This class includes the peace-offerings.

4. The fourth class, which was perhaps only differentiated at a comparatively late period, and has points in common both with the third and with the fifth classes, consists of gifts that were in part burnt on the altar and for the rest consumed by the priests. This class includes the great majority of the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings.

5. The fifth class consists of gifts that were wholly burnt on the altar—after, in the case of animal gifts, the withdrawal of the blood, which was thrown against the altar, and the hide. This class consists primarily of the burnt-offerings.

This classification comprehends, as nearly as any, all the sacred gifts of the Hebrews, the principle of classification resting on the principle of the extent to which the altar receives and retains the gift and the extent to which the giver parts with it. A perfectly simple division would consist of (1) those gifts of which the altar retains nothing; this would include the first two of the foregoing five classes; (2) those gifts of which the altar retains some part but not the whole, which would include classes three and four of the foregoing classification; and (3) those gifts of which the altar retains all—identical with class five above. But the former and fuller classification, though it has some inconveniences perhaps, at least serves to bring out the very important distinction between the destruction of the remainders of sacred gifts which are in part, but only in part, retained by the altar.

With these classifications before us we may proceed to look as certain on the significant elements of ritual which differentiate certain classes of sacred gifts and at the same time link up some of these gifts to what were not gifts at all though the subject of ritual.

The last three classes of gifts enumerated above differed from the first two in being subject (1) to a fire-ritual, and (2) so far as they consisted of animals, to a blood-ritual. For gifts subject to a fire-ritual the Jews, of the later period at all events, had a special term—אשה, denoting an object burnt in the fire (of the altar). For gifts subject to the blood-ritual no special term was created, and if it had been it would have cut clean across the well-marked division into burnt-offering, sin-offering, &c., for some of these were subject to a blood-ritual if the gift was an

animal, but not if it was not. 'Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission' of sin by means of the sin-offering was, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was well aware, not a statement that could be made absolutely. Not only would a special term for objects subject to blood-ritual cut across the divisions of offerings into burnt-offerings, &c., it would also have included objects which were not gifts to Yahweh at all.

It has sometimes been discussed whether the red cow, the ashes of which were used as an ingredient in the liquid prepared and used for the removal of uncleanness incurred by contact with the dead, was a sacrifice or not. If we understand by sacrifice at least so much as that it was an oblation at the altar, then the red cow was certainly not a sacrifice; for it was not an oblation or gift at all, and so far from being presented at the altar it was both slain and burnt without the camp. On the other hand, like animals presented at the altar, it was subject to a blood-ritual and a fire-ritual, though of these both it is true differed *in certain details* from the blood and fire-ritual customary in the case of animals presented at the altar. Only a portion of the blood was subject to ritual manipulation, the rest being left in the carcass which was burnt, skin and all, outside the camp. Even in this last feature the ritual with the red cow approaches closely to the ritual with certain sin-offerings (cp. *Numbers*, 250); for the flesh of these, too, was burnt without the camp, though only after the animal had been presented at and certain parts of it burnt on the altar. Finally, like certain gifts at the altar, the slaughter of the red cow was carried out with a view to the removal of ritual unfitness. We may say then that the red cow differed from sacrifices in one substantial point alone: they were gifts at the altar, it was not.

Another animal victim which was in no way regarded as a gift, but was subject to certain ritual away from the altar, was the young heifer that had never been worked, which was slain beside running water where a murdered man had been found in the open country and the murderer was unknown (Dt. $21^{1-9}$). In this case, however, there is no fire-ritual and no blood-ritual; the chief element in the ritual is the solemn slaying of the victim and the washing of hands that is performed over the carcass.

Clearly as this and one or two other rites differ in the developed Jewish ritual system in regard to their treatment from animal victims presented at the altar, it may be that if we could trace the rites concerned in all these cases, we should find that the red cow, the heifer slain over running water, and animals burnt on the altar were nevertheless more closely related to one another than were the animal victims and the non-animal victims which are alike comprehended in the Jewish system under the category of sacred gifts. Be this as it may, the comparison helps to bring out afresh what I ventured by anticipation at the beginning of these lectures to point out, that while what are called Jewish sacrifices were all of them certainly gifts and felt to be such, some of them were also something more. The fire-ritual to which nearly all gifts at the altar were subject has been, and may perhaps without overstraining in the absence of clear indications to the contrary be, explained as organically connected with the conception of gift to God; by means of the fire the food presented was sublimated into a form which to developing conceptions of deity appeared more suited for consumption by the deity. In part, again, the ritual has been explained as a means of conveying to the deity the part of the victim most valuable or acceptable for food; but though this again might, failing good evidence to the contrary, explain the tossing of blood against the altar or pouring it down at its base, it cannot explain the application of the blood to the person of the offerer. Finally there is the ritual meal: what is burnt on the altar might, as already remarked, have been originally so treated in order to prepare food for the deity; and further what was consumed by the priests might still be regarded, and indeed was regarded, as a gift to the deity passed on by him to his proxies, the priests; but what was eaten by the offerer cannot be fully explained in any satisfactory way as a gift to the deity.

Jewish sacrifices, then, were gifts to the deity; and as such we have been considering them and examining how deeply and in what way the idea of gifts to God affected Jewish religious thought and practice. But some Jewish sacrifices were doubtless in origin and remained, or if not so in origin became, more than gifts to God; they represent a combination of rites, some of

which sprang out of entirely other conceptions, and in some cases continued to symbolize other conceptions—of fellowship with the deity perhaps, of propitiation, of purification. All these other ideas also deserve separate examination; I have selected the influence of the idea of gift because, as I said at the outset, it is in danger of being overstressed or underestimated, because too it had attained perhaps its maximum of influence in the age of the N.T. and because it certainly formed part of that environment of thought which it is essential for any sound study and vivid appreciation of the N.T. and the new religion correctly and fully to appreciate.

3. *The Practice of Commutation.* I pass to consider the tendency, I think it may quite safely be said, the increasing tendency, in the history of Hebrew religion, to commute sacrifices or gifts in kind into money, or to regard sacrifices and other gifts to God in the light of their money value. If we have to consider whether Hebrew sacrifice originally sprang out of, or at any particular period was mainly associated with the idea of communion or the idea of gift, it will I suppose be obvious that wherever we find, and in proportion as we find, commutation or money valuation of sacrifice, it points to the absence or waning of any idea of communion and to the presence or strengthening of the idea of gift. It has, indeed, been urged that among certain *primitive* peoples union of an intimate character is established by an *exchange* of gifts.[1] But the tendency among the Jews to whom we have to attend is not among 'primitive peoples', and it has nothing to do with an *exchange* of gifts; and we may add that money is the most impersonal of things, and least fitted of all gifts to establish a bond of union. Money may be given to purchase a keepsake or to purchase a memorial ring, but keepsake or ring converted back into money is keepsake and memorial no longer.

I turn first to the law of the first-born: the essential clause in

[1] We are informed, for example, that 'among the Eskimos of Behring Straits persons exchanging presents at the Asking Festival are considered to hold a certain temporary relationship. . . . A somewhat similar instance is that of the Tarahumare, with whom a purchase establishes a kind of brotherhood between the parties to it' (*ERE* vi. 202 b—Sir Philip Hamilton-Grierson).

Ex. $22^{28\,f.}$ (E.V.$^{29\,f.}$) is, 'The first-born shalt thou give unto me'; the notion of gift is already expressed in the law. On the other hand in Ex. $34^{19}$ the law is stated in a form that does not express the notion, viz. in these words: 'All that openeth the womb', i.e. every first-born, 'is mine': i.e. every first-born is possessed of an inherent sanctity which has various effects. Into the various complicated questions as to the origin of the sanctity of the first-born and its history we do not need to inquire here; but there are certain points that are clear (or at least tolerably clear) and of importance for our present inquiry. The first-born fall into three classes according to their treatment: (1) first-born of clean animals; (2) of unclean animals; (3) of men.

In the earliest law the first-born of clean animals were sacrificed on the eighth day from birth to Yahweh (Ex. $22^{20\,f.}$ (E.V.$^{30\,f.}$), $13^{15}$ (זבח), $34^{19}$). According to the law of Deuteronomy the first-born of clean animals were ambiguously treated; on the one hand, they were subject to restrictions as potentially given to Yahweh; thus the first-born of kine might not be used for labour, nor might the wool of the first-born of sheep be shorn off and used; i.e. as belonging to or given to Yahweh they were not available for man's purposes. On the other hand, when at the end of the year the gift came to be completed by the slaughter of the first-born animal at the central sanctuary, it was not wholly burnt on the altar, but it was eaten at a sacred meal before Yahweh by the owner, i.e. it was subject to that particular kind of sacrificial ritual which suggests that the sacrifices so treated are not ultimately and entirely explained as gifts to Yahweh (Dt. $15^{19-23}$, cp. Ex. $13^{15}$ (J): 'Therefore I sacrifice unto Yahweh all that openeth the womb'). Later, on the other hand, dead or alive the first-born passed wholly out of the possession and use of the owner into the possession of Yahweh who assigned it to the priesthood (Num. $18^{15\,f.}$). The parts that had previously been burnt on the altar continued to be burnt on the altar, but the remainder of the flesh no longer furnished a meal for the owner of the first-born, but went wholly to the priest (Num. $18^{17\,f.}$).

According to early law unclean animals were withdrawn from man's use or redeemed; the sanctity which attached to the

animal, or the taboo to which it was subject originally, perhaps always, withdrew it from human use; but even by the time of the early law the alternative was allowed of redeeming it by a young sheep or goat (Ex. $13^{13}$, $[34^{20}]$) which in this case was doubtless treated as a first-born of clean animals; i.e. it was eaten at a sacred meal by the owner. Having been thus redeemed the actual first-born animal was released from its sanctity and taboo; i.e. the notion of its *inherent* sanctity is breaking down and the way is being prepared for its coming to be regarded as something that must be given, itself or its equivalent. On the other hand, so long as the redemption must be and can be only by means of a clean animal which is sacrificially eaten by its owner, the transition to a mere gift or tax is not complete. But this transition takes place and the last stage is reached within the O.T.; for P (Num. $18^{15}$) withdraws the option of redeeming by a clean animal to be eaten by the owner: the entire value of the unclean beast must go to the priest; an alternative of redeeming or not redeeming is still allowed, but in either case the priest as Yahweh's proxy gets full value; if the owner particularly wants a special first-born animal he can have it by paying to the priest the value the priest sets on it *plus* a fifth of that value; if the owner does not redeem, the priest sells the beast to another and keeps the price. The inherent sanctity of the first-born has in this case worn very thin and little is left but a tax on unclean animals owned by Jews, equal in amount to the value of the first-born. And this is already the established practice in N.T. times.

Even in the earliest laws the first-born of men must be redeemed. How the first-born were given to Yahweh before this period, whether they were ever actually sacrificed, or whether they were devoted to sacred service or what not, is a much debated question which must not detain us here. Nor again does the early law state *how* they were redeemed, whether as in the case of an unclean animal by a clean animal to which the story of the substitution of a ram for Isaac might point, or by a money payment as in the later law. But the later law and practice is clear. The first-born of man were redeemed at five shekels, i.e. about 12*s.* a head (Num. $18^{16}$) and this went to the priest. What may, then, in early times have been some-

thing more than or other than a mere gift develops into a mere money payment, a sacred tax of 12*s.* on the first birth in any Jewish family.[1]

In early times under special circumstances as by a vow other persons might be given to Yahweh: Jephthah's daughter is the classical example. Again we need not here determine whether Jephthah's daughter was slain (a human sacrifice) or was given to Yahweh in some other way. The essential fact to observe is that the custom of vowing persons to Yahweh outlived the custom of sacrificing them to him; and that in all such cases the vowed person had to be commuted for money—a male between 20 and 60 for 50 shekels—say £6, and between 5 and 20 for 20 shekels; a female of the same age for half the above amounts; a child under five if a male for 5, if a female for 3 shekels; a man of 60 for 15 shekels, and a woman at the same age for 10 (Lev. $27^{1-8}$). It has been suggested that the varying amounts are determined by the values of the person in the labour market[2], but this would appear to be at least an inadequate explanation; for a little girl under five is scarcely of less value in the labour market than a little boy, and it may be doubted whether either from that standpoint is worth 7*s.* 6*d.*

A similar movement away from inherent sanctity to a tax calculated by percentage is seen in the case of tithe. Down to the time of Deuteronomy tithe must have been paid and eaten. For that was the custom in the country; each farmer with his family would feast at the sacred meal on the produce of his own farm. But Deuteronomy requires all these sacred meals to be eaten at Jerusalem. In cases where it would be inconvenient to carry the tithe all this distance Deuteronomy therefore allows the actual tithe of the produce to be sold; the *money* obtained by the sale is to be taken to Jerusalem and

[1] The comparison of such dues with taxes is already given by Philo (*De Praem. Sac.* ii), who dwells, however, on the different spirit in which payment was made: men pay taxes to their rulers 'under compulsion, and with great unwillingness, looking on the collectors of taxes as common enemies and destroyers', whereas the Jews contribute their payments to the priests with joy and cheerfulness, anticipating the collectors and cutting short the time allowed for making the contributions.

[2] [Cp. e.g. Kennedy, *Leviticus* (*Cent. B.*), p. 177.]

here spent in purchasing materials for a sacred meal (Dt. $14^{23-7}$). According to some interpretations of the passage firstlings of clean animals could be similarly dealt with.[1] This practice of commutation into money must have been widely resorted to by the loyal Jews of the Diaspora, whose distance from Jerusalem must have made it impossible except on the rarest occasions to present the sacred gifts in kind.

Once again without turning aside to discuss the various difficult questions that gather around the terms, it is necessary briefly to refer to the חטאת and the אשם in relation to money. According to our theory the animal sacrifices known in English as the sin-offering and the guilt-offering are a relatively late development in Hebrew religion; what corresponded to them in earlier times were fines, a compensation for injury done; so for injury done to Yahweh in having taken the Ark captive the Philistines send back with it an אשם (R.V. guilt-offering) consisting of objects of gold. And in 2 Ki. $12^{17}$ (E.V.$^{16}$) we have a reference to the כסף חטאת and כסף אשם which it is said used not to be brought into the Temple, but used to become directly the property of the priests. Here too under this silver for guilt and silver for sin we seem to have to do with money payments perhaps especially for ritual offences. If, now, these pre-exilic money payments are replaced after the exile by corresponding and similarly named sacrifices of animals we may seem to have an example of the opposite tendency to that which I am tracing. But there are two points to be observed if the full significance of this apparently contrary tendency is to be rightly seized: (1) the particular sacrifices in question would in that case unquestionably originate in a system of fines or payments-in-compensation which would be but a particular development of present or gift as understood by the Hebrews as well as many other persons: and (2) in the case of the אשם in particular we have evidence that the money-value retained prominence. In Lev. $5^{15 f.}$ a guilt-offering is required if any one has unwittingly failed to present, or converted to secular uses, any of the things claimed by Yahweh, such as tithes or first-fruits; and it is added that in such a case the guilt-offering must consist of a ram worth

[1] Bertholet, *ad loc.*, but otherwise Driver; cp. Schürer, *DB.* V. 107 b, 108 a; *EP* II. ii. 243).

some shekels in value. The oral law working on this decided that the minimum value of all guilt-offerings, except of two special cases, those, viz. of the Nazirite and the leper, must be two shekels, and in the exceptional cases one (Zebahim x. 5).

The prominent place taken in later times by the idea of cost in connexion with sacrifices may also be illustrated by reference to the later history of Nazirites. These later Nazirites are a rather ambiguous feature in later Judaism. On the one hand, if the institution had become a mere abuse, we cannot believe that a man like St. Paul would have had anything to do with it; on the other hand, we cannot read Nazir without feeling that it lent itself to trivial uses and in many cases had little to do with serious religious feeling. The interest of it lies here, that the sacrifices required by the law in Num. 6 at the close of the period of the vow tended to be regarded largely as a matter of expense. It is the expenses of these sacrifices that comes before us in Acts; Paul takes upon himself the expenses of the sacrifices which four who had taken the vow were about to offer (Acts $21^{23 f.}$). It is the expense of the sacrifice that explains this judgement in the Mishnah: If one man says I will be a Nazirite and also bind myself to shave a Nazirite, i.e. to provide the sacrifices necessary when another Nazirite is shorn, at the end of the period of his vow, and his companion hearing him says, I too will be a Nazirite and bind myself to shave another Nazirite; then if they are wise they will shave one another (thereby diminishing the expenditure) and if not they will shave third parties. Again the first thought, of many at least, after they had, perhaps rashly, taken the vow, was of the money required to purchase the he-lamb, the ewe-lamb, the ram, the fine-meal and the many pints of wine and oil which they would have to provide for sacrifices at the end of the time. And part of the casuistry of the Mishnah is devoted to determining what happens in a variety of cases to the money which a woman who had taken a vow had set apart for this purpose, but is not used for that purpose because her husband, exercising his rights under the law, subsequently annuls the vow. And lastly in this connexion we may note the tendency of the vow to degenerate into a bet: when several people, says the Mishnah tractate, 'are walking along a road and some one approaches

rom the opposite direction, and one of the party says I'll be a Nazirite if that is so-and-so, and another says I'll be a Nazirite f that is so-and-so, and a third says I'll be a Nazirite if either of you is, and a fourth I'll be a Nazirite if either of you is not, or if both of you are, or if all of you are; then the house of Shammai says, They must all be Nazirites, but the house of Hillel says, He only must be a Nazirite whose assertion about the approaching stranger proves wrong' (Nazir v. 5). This form of fining yourself for a mistaken guess had this advantage over a fine of money exactly equal to the normal offerings, in that an element of hazard entered into the Nazirite's vow; the inconvenience of abstention from wine and from having one's hair cut for a month and the cost of the normal sacrifices were the minimum risk; but if within the month a Nazirite had the misfortune to incur defilement he had to offer certain offerings for the defilement and then start all over again.

The commutation of sacred gifts into money is one way by which such gifts come to be regarded in the light of their money value. Whether as a consequence of this, or independently, gifts and sacrifices were so conceived at times apart from actual or contemplated commutation. There is a passage which in this respect is instructive at the end of the appeal of the Jewish community at Elephantine to the Persian Governor of Judah in 408 B.C.: if, they say, he will grant their request that the Temple of Yahweh in Elephantine may be rebuilt and offerings including burnt-offerings burnt on the altar of Yahweh there, then—I now cite the actual words—'thou shalt get verdict (צדקה יהוה לך) before Yahu the God of heaven greater than that of a man who presents to him burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (דבחן) worth more than 1,000 talents of silver'.[1]

There is a well known and important distinction, as old as Josephus, between the public and the private sacrifices of the Jews. The tendency which I have last been tracing affects, so far as our evidence goes, almost exclusively the private sacrifices. That this means that the one set was regarded as gifts, the other not as gifts would be an erroneous conclusion to draw;

[1] [A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, No. 30, ll. 27-8.]

other if not so varied evidence points to similar tendencies affecting the public as well as the private sacrifices; and the evidence taken as a whole is sufficiently wide and uniform to suggest that in the course of history the idea of gift in connexion with sacrifices strengthened its hold on and its domination over other ideas in a variety of ways.

# III

## SACRIFICES AND SACRED OFFERINGS

### iii

THE last evidence of the extent to which Jewish sacrifices were regarded as gifts which I propose to examine is the criticism by the prophets of Jewish sacrificial custom.

The chief passages (Hos. $6^{4-6}$, Am. $4^{4}$, $5^{21-5}$, Is. $1^{10-17}$, Mic. $6^{6-8}$, Jer. $7^{21\,f.}$) in which the prophetic criticism of sacrifice is found are well known. One point common to most of them is that the gifts are a means of gratification to those that offer them, and not to Yahweh; i.e. in so far as they are regarded as gifts the gifts are declared by the prophets to be more agreeable to the givers than to the recipient, though by no means in the sense that it was in this case more *blessed* to give than to receive. This charge is to be understood when we gather together the hints that this group of passages contains, pointing to the fact that the prophets had largely, though at the same time it is clear that they had not exclusively, in view the sacrifices which furnished a sacred meal for the giver of them. For one thing, in all these passages except that in Micah the terms (זבח and שלם) referring in particular to this type of sacrifice occur. Then the fact that this type of sacrifice is prominent in the prophet's mind makes possible the biting sarcasm of Jeremiah's exhortation: 'Add your burnt-offerings to your peace-offerings, and eat flesh!' i.e. Treat the sacrifice that was, according to custom, burnt whole on the altar exactly as those which were mainly eaten by the worshipper: the one kind gives Yahweh no more satisfaction than the other: he will accept neither.

Since, then, the prophets refer largely and especially, though

not exclusively, to the peace-offering, i.e. to the sacrifices that were in most part not burnt on the altar of Yahweh but eaten by men, it might be surmised that the prophets in their denunciations are not especially thinking of sacrifices as gifts to God; and if they stood by themselves the passages in Amos and Hosea in particular might not perhaps suffice to show clearly that such a surmise was wrong.[1]

But whatever doubts there might be with regard to these passages, that in Isaiah and that in Micah show with all clearness that the prophets are really criticizing a system which was regarded by those who put their trust in it as a system, not of establishing communion with God, but of making gifts to Yahweh in order to secure his favour. 'Bring no more vain gifts' in Isaiah is sufficiently unambiguous even if the Massoretic division and punctuation of the text which governs this English translation were correct; still more explicit is what was more probably the original form: 'To bring gifts (מנחת) is a vain thing.' The same point of view comes out too in the prophet's direct challenge to the law: 'Ye shall not see my face empty-handed.' Isaiah says, 'When you come to see my face, who hath required this?' viz. the burnt-offerings and the blood and sacrificial fat of other offerings referred to just before. You think, Isaiah says in effect, Yahweh requires you to come before him with hands full of presents for him. He does nothing of the kind. In Micah the point of view which regards sacrifices as gifts dominates the whole reference to sacrifices; to the prophet his people in their perplexity ask, 'What gift is costly enough to please Yahweh, willingly would we give it to him if thereby we could get him to wipe out our debt to him which is entailed by our sins and transgressions.' The point is clear enough in the familiar English version, but I cite it here with one or two modifications, bringing out a little more fully the force of one or two Hebrew idioms.

[1] Though even in these passages there are some significant hints that the idea of sacrifice as gift was not absent; Amos couples together tithe, which most readily suggests the idea of tax or tribute, and peace-offerings; and his references to the bringing of sacrificial *minḥah* in the wilderness recall most strikingly, as we saw previously, the bringing of tributary *minḥah* to earthly sovereigns.

Bringing what, shall I come before Yahweh,
Shall I bow before the God of the Height?
Shall I come before him bringing burnt-offerings,
Bringing calves of a year old?
Will Yahweh be pleased with[1] thousands of rams,
With ten-thousands of torrents of oil?
Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,
The fruit of my womb for the sin of my soul?

To the prophets, then, the people seemed to act on the theory that what God wanted was more and costlier gifts, heavier payments; and that the suitable gifts to give him were slain animals; and that in the extremity of their perplexity they could even think of giving him the slain bodies of their own children. The prophets repudiate this theory of gifts. Whether they actually set themselves absolutely against all sacrifice, we need not here determine. What we have to observe, however, is this: in repudiating the popular theory of sacrifice as gifts, the prophets never made the slightest attempt to recall or establish the claims of any other theory of sacrifice in its place. They do not call the people back to a theory of sacrifice as a means of communion with God; there is not the slightest suggestion in any of their sayings that they were aware that any such idea had ever been held and was now abandoned or disregarded, or that they thought that such an idea ought now to be imposed upon sacrifice. It is not clear indeed that all the prophets had won so clear of the conservative instinct that they would, even if they could, have overthrown all the local altars of their time; we know that Elijah quite on the contrary mourned their overthrow; still less have we ground to think that Isaiah, let us say, would have overthrown the altar and stopped the sacrificial service at Jerusalem. They were prepared to tolerate, and even themselves to make use of, these ancient institutions of religion, if only the people would not abuse them, by giving them a place in life that Yahweh never intended them to have. Practically, however, their attitude towards sacrifice, even unabused sacrifice, is at best one of indifference; *Yahweh* is spirit and not flesh, and does not need man's fleshly gifts:

[1] As the following lines show, i. e. if I give him.

God doth not need
Either man's work, or his own gifts;
Who best bear His mild yoke, they serve Him best.

Over against the people's trust in sacrifice they place another conception of religion which requires no sacrifice of animals, no material gifts to God. God desires not sacrifice but the knowledge of God, not sacrifice but justice and mercy which are the necessary outcome of knowledge of God. Over against the theory that God's favour was to be obtained by multiplying and magnifying sacrificial gifts we may say, indeed, that the prophets held forth the truth that God's favour is found by man's becoming, like himself, just and merciful, and that religion is to be found in Israel's returning God's knowledge of and care for Israel by knowing and caring for God. In brief we may say the tenour of their teaching was, not gifts but fellowship; but the way to fellowship which they pointed out was not through the existing sacrificial system re-interpreted, but through conduct. In a word, then, the prophetic criticism of sacrifice shows clearly, if indirectly, how dominant in the popular thought was the gift theory of sacrifice; it is wholly silent as to the existence, whether in popular thought or in the thought of the prophets, of the conception of fellowship with God through sacrifice, through in particular the consumption of the flesh of peace-offerings, and there is no evidence that this idea, though it may originally have created the rites, was seen after the times of the prophets or associated with it. Thus the prophets prepared the way for a religion in which sacrificial gifts of material objects would or need play no part.

The fact that Israel gave gifts to Yahweh, and the theory that Israel ought to give gifts to Yahweh, was crossed by another idea that existed in one form or another always, and was specially powerful at certain times or in certain schools. This was the doctrine or idea that Israel received everything from Yahweh. It followed that in giving gifts to Yahweh Israel was returning to him what had been his own. We need not call the two ideas contradictory; or if we did need to do so the contradiction would not be limited to Hebrew thought and practice, but would be found in most religions. But the two ideas certainly cross one another, and mutually react on one another.

If the religion of Israel runs back to a stage when sacrifice was in no case a matter of gift, but entirely a means of communion, the crossing of the ideas enters in at some specific point in history, but at a point that lies further back than our knowledge carries us. The idea of gifts to God is, as we have seen, well established in the earliest known period of Hebrew religion.

The crossing of the two thoughts reaches classical expression at a late date in the words: 'For all things come of thee, and of thine own (מידך) have we given thee' (1 Chron. $29^{14}$). The whole of David's prayer in which he commends to Yahweh the treasure which the people have voluntarily dedicated to provide the wherewithal for building the Temple is worthy of study in considering the crossing of the two thoughts of gifts bestowed by Yahweh on Israel and of gifts bestowed by Israel on Yahweh.

The idea that all that Israel has comes from Yahweh finds constant and massive expression in the conception, found early as well as late, of the land of promise. It is an idea, too, that must have been associated with the local cults before Israel settled in their land. The gifts of the fertility of the soil were associated with the local Baals; the people often identified local Baals and Yahweh; the prophets repudiated the identification; but the terms they use show clearly how deeply ingrained alike in prophets and in people was the thought that the very things they brought to Yahweh were first of all a gift to them whether from Yahweh or the Baals. Israel, in Hosea's eyes, recognizes fully enough that her bread and her water, her wool and her flax, her oil and her wine, are not the fruits of her own labour, but gifts; only she commits the consummate folly of not recognizing that it was Yahweh who was the giver, and not the Baals whom she has turned to serve (Hos. $2^{7, 10}$ (E.V.$^{5, 8}$)).

But this thought is far too familiar and too prominent in the O.T. for it to be necessary to illustrate it further. I have alluded to it, and to its crossing the thought of gifts to God, with a view to concluding the examination of the prophetic criticism of the latter of these ideas by some reference to Deuteronomy. Not gifts but justice, not sacrifice but mercy; that is the prophetic teaching of the O.T., and it is reiterated in the N.T. (Mt. $9^{13}$), and was used by Johanan ben Zakkai to prove that, though Temple and altar had perished, the heart

of religion could beat still. If the prophetic teaching meant sacrifices must be forthwith abolished, then Deuteronomy only to a partial extent at most embodies the prophetic teaching; for it does not abolish sacrifice, it regulates it. The book does not omit all reference to sacrifice as gift even; it repeats the old law, 'they shall not see my face empty-handed', and even adds, 'every man according to the gift of his hand' (כמתנת ידו, cp. מסת נדבת ידך (כ), $16^{10}$), $16^{16f.}$, i. e. bringing such presents as he can afford: and we can hardly suppose that Yahweh was not in a certain sense regarded as the immediate recipient of what each brings in his hands. But we observe first that the crossing thought of God not as recipient but as bestower rounds off the sentence, 'according to the blessing of Yahweh which he hath given to thee'; secondly, that as a matter of fact the destination of the gifts, directly contemplated in the context, is the man and his family together with the poor of his acquaintance, pre-eminently the Levite of his township, the *gēr*, the orphans and the widows. By so directing the gifts which Yahweh has bestowed upon him he may secure, as another passage puts it, that Yahweh may (again) bless him in all the business of the coming year ($14^{29}$).

Nevertheless Deuteronomy did its best to steep the minds of the Israelites as they went up to their annual festivals, and as they dedicated the fruit of the year, not with the thought that they were giving something to Yahweh, still less that by so doing they could constrain his acceptance of them and extort his favour, but with thoughts of what Yahweh had done for Israel in bringing them out of Egypt, of what he had given them in the goodly land of Canaan, and of his constant renewal of his gifts in yearly crops and in the yearly increase of the herds and flocks. These thoughts are prominent throughout the book, and only most strikingly so in the liturgy prescribed in ch. 26 for the presentation of first-fruits. When the basket of new fruit is brought to the Temple, the offerer recites the words, 'I profess unto thee this day that I am come into the land which Yahweh swore unto our Fathers to give us.' The basket is set down before the altar, and the offerer recites the record of the deliverance from Egypt, the settlement in the land flowing with milk and honey given to Israel by Yahweh,

and concludes with the words, 'And now, behold I have brought the first of the fruits of the ground which thou, O Lord, hast given me.' To the author of the Priestly Code first-fruits are what the Israelites give to Yahweh, and he in turn to the priest (Num. $18^{13}$); to the author of Deuteronomy they are the symbol of what Yahweh has given to the Israelites, or rather a representative portion of the entire gift of Yahweh brought into his presence that in the presence of both the gift and the divine giver he may solemnly recognize and gratefully acknowledge the goodness of God.

Just as little as Deuteronomy abolishes sacrifice does it abolish dues to the priest; but it calls them dues to the priest, a suitable payment for the services which he renders to Israel (Dt. $18^{3f.}$); it does not, like the Priestly Code, call them gifts to Yahweh.

The gifts of Yahweh to Israel ought to call up feelings of gratitude and joy; and so in Deuteronomy sacrifice is pre-eminently regarded as a joyful feast eaten before Yahweh and in remembrance of what he has done. To sacrifice, to eat before Yahweh, to rejoice before Yahweh, have here become synonymous.

It is not, then, perhaps by accident that neither the early term מנחה, nor the later term קרבן, which alike include sacrifices under the category of gifts, appears in the Book of Deuteronomy. Under the influence of the prophets, though sacrifice survives, the idea that it is a gift to God, that God can take pleasure in bulls and goats and sheep and the produce of the soil presented to him by men, has not indeed been given up, but it has fallen into the background. The idea that all that Israel has is given by Yahweh has come into prominence, and with this idea sacrifice is associated. Thus, though in Deuteronomy the belief that sacrifices are gifts to God is certainly not discarded, sacrifice is less regarded as a means to obtain God's favour than as an opportunity for acknowledging his goodness and the manifold benefits which he has bestowed. There is here some suggestion, more at least than in the prophets, of a re-interpretation of sacrifice, but a re-interpretation that does not return to or introduce the belief that actual participation in a sacrificial meal was a means to communion with God, but a re-interpretation which treats sacrifices as historical and memorial symbols, a development which in a wider way also interpreted the great

festivals not in their agricultural significance but as memorials of great redemptive acts of God in history.

But though Deuteronomy may in some measure represent a re-interpretation of sacrifice apart from the all-dominating conception of it as gift to God, and though in the later literature, as for example in some of the Psalms (40, 51), the thought reappears that slain animals are not the gifts that God desires, yet the later priestly schools, as we have already seen, do subsume all forms of altar ritual under the category of gifts to God; and the duty of making these gifts they regard as eternally binding.

The influence of both the prophetic and the later priestly attitude is well seen in Ecclesiasticus. To Ben Sira sacrifices are again gifts, but the ethical criticism of the prophets has also left its mark on him; he does not by any means repudiate sacred gifts altogether, but he lays stress on the character of the offerer. The passage is unfortunately not among the recovered parts of the Hebrew original, and there is uncertainty in the detail of any translation based on the versions, but substantially this represents his standpoint, which in many ways is interesting as revealing the attitude of a writer of the second century B.C.

[1] $31^{19\,(21)}$ (34) The sacrifice of the unrighteous is a mocking (or blameworthy) offering,
And the gifts of the lawless are unacceptable,
(E.V. $34^{18\,f.}$) The Most High hath no pleasure in the offerings of the ungodly
Nor at (the price of) a multitude of sacrifices doth he forgive sins.
$32^{1}$ (35) He that keepeth the law multiplieth presents,
He that heedeth the commandments offereth a peace-offering,
(E.V. $35^{1\,ff.}$) He that practiseth kindness offereth a meat-offering,
And he that showeth mercy presenteth a thank-offering,
What is well-pleasing to the Lord is to avoid evil,
And the way to forgiveness is to avoid wickedness,
Appear not in the presence of the Lord with empty hands
For all these things (are to be done) for the sake of the commandment.

[1] The reference figures are those of Swete's edition of the LXX.

The gift of the righteous man maketh fat the altar
And its sweet savour (cometh) before the Most High.
The meal-offering of a righteous man is acceptable
And its memorial is not forgotten.

In another passage ($35^{12\,ff.}$) the writer makes the point which is sufficiently clear even in the Versions, that God cannot be bribed by the sacrificial gifts of rich persons; but on the other hand the cry for justice of the oppressed, though he can offer no sacrifice at all, is accepted, his cry being treated as itself an acceptable offering.

There is another aspect of gift that calls for consideration. A gift is the transference of something from one person to another; it involves deprivation on the one side, gain on the other. What gain God obtains from men's sacrificial gifts to him was a question which received at different times different answers, including the prophetic that God receives none. But the deprivation on the part of man was obvious, and capable of securing for the practice of giving gifts to God a vital meaning even when what was involved in acceptance by God was no longer vividly apprehended (cp. fasting as a substitute for sacrifice after the fall of the Temple, Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 123, 'Fasting as a penitential rite was, in the Rabbinic view, allied to sacrifice. But this idea only came to the front after the destruction of the Temple. The Talmud records that R. Shesheth (third century A.D.) on fast days was wont to pray: "Master of the Universe, it is revealed before thee that while the Temple stood, a man sinned and brought sacrifice, of which only the fat and blood was offered, and this atoned for him; and now I have sat fasting and my fat and blood has been diminished. May it be thy will that it may be accounted unto me as though I had offered it on the altar, and do thou accept it from me with favour."' Cp. also ib., p. 124, 'almsgiving is a sacrifice of money, fasting of one's body'.) The devotion of man to God expressed by his readiness to part with what he valued at God's command is the perfectly clear moral of the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac; how Isaac as a burnt-offering would have passed over into God's possession and become a gain to him, the story never considers. The attention given to the cost of sacrifices,

with which I dealt in the last lecture, naturally also connects most immediately with this dominance of the thought of what the sacrificer loses rather than of what God the recipient gains. And from this again the transition is not difficult to the thought of self-surrender, whether as that without which no gifts of a man's outward possessions have value, or as a more than sufficient substitute for these when men are hindered from making the sacrifices required by the law: the gifts which God always desires and never rejects or leaves men without the opportunity of making are the broken spirit, the contrite heart, the complete readiness to do the will of God, to make life conform to the law of God written on the heart (Pss. 40, 51). These ideas are distinctly associated with the conception of sacrifice as gift; they are also, at least by some writers of the O.T., not put forward as a substitute for the practice of external sacrifice; the author of the closing verses of Ps. 51 would retain alongside of the inward gift, the self-surrender, the custom of giving outward gifts in the form of animals offered as burnt- or peace-offerings.

The Hebrew sacrificial system was destined to cease in the first century. It had played so important a part in the Jewish religion of that and the immediately preceding centuries that the cessation of it might have been expected to have had a profound influence on the religion. An influence doubtless it had, but perhaps rather in releasing and in giving freer play to higher religious functions than in robbing the religion of what at that time still remained really vital or essential to it. Influence even after its cessation was exercised by the system on the thoughts and practices alike of the Jewish religion that looked on the cessation merely as a cessation, and on the Christian religion that looked upon it as the abolition of something that could never be restored. With a brief examination, then, of certain aspects, for that is all that is possible, of this system on the eve of its cessation, I will bring these lectures to a close.

I used just now the phrase, the term, sacrificial system: strictly speaking there is something more and something less than the system of sacred gifts. There were sacred gifts that were capable of being continued and were continued after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, as there were elements in the

sacrificial system that at least on a critical examination of it are not explicable as gifts. But the gifts associated with an altar ritual—by far the larger part of the entire class of sacred gifts—became, with the destruction of the Temple, incapable of being given; and all that was presented at the altar had come to be included in the category of sacred gifts. Without going over the ground again I must briefly recall here that, as I pointed out at the time, the various lines of evidence that indicate the vitality of the idea that sacrifices were material gifts given by man to God agree in indicating that that vitality was at its greatest in the first century: the term *Ḳorbān* under which they were comprehended was a term that still vividly expressed the sense of gift, the practice of commutation was retained to the fullest extent, and the habit of considering sacrifices from the point of view of their cost can be particularly illustrated from this latest period.

Broadly speaking, then, the earlier sacrificial system was looked upon as a system of gifts required by God. But—and here I touch on a second characteristic of the period—the nature of the gifts themselves and the ritual with which they were given were not associated with the generally accepted explanation; the offerings did not suggest, for example, as perhaps in a crude way some of them had originally suggested, that by means of them the divine life in man was renewed and strengthened. Widely and largely the entire ritual was simply accepted as ordinances of God; God had willed them so; and that was enough. This point of view already appears in Ecclesiasticus. Men were not to appear empty-handed before God, because the divine commandment so required. It is frequently formulated by Rabbis of the first and following centuries: Johanan b. Zakkai represents God as saying: 'I have decreed a decree: no man is allowed to transgress my decree: it is written, This is the ordinance of the law (cp. δικαιώματα λατρείας[1]): and that is sufficient reason for performing the ritual'. Simeon b. Azzai (A.D. 100–130), in an interesting comment that shows a reaction against the estimate of sacrifices merely according to cost, remarks that as the expression 'a sweet

[1] Heb. 9[1].

savour' is used when an ox is offered so it is also used when a sheep or a goat or even a bird is offered, in order to teach the lesson that he who offers much and he who offers little is alike before God. For God neither eats nor drinks what is offered to him (Sifre on Num. $28^3$, ed. Horowitz, p. 191 f.). 'Why then does he say: "Slay animals for me"? In order that (as he had commanded) his will might be done.'

We are unfortunate in having no systematic treatment of the meaning and purpose of Jewish sacrifice from a Palestinian Jew of the first century—Josephus only very partially supplies the want, for the Diaspora Philo speaks, for Jewish Christians the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Philo recognizes the sufficiency of the fact that the system is a matter of divine commandment, and this perhaps also underlies the reference in Hebrews to the *δικαιώματα λατρείας* ($9^1$). But both writers seek a further interpretation in symbolism.

From the very nature of the case the symbolism of the Hebrews was something of which those who had hitherto followed it were unconscious: in other words it is a novelty. The same to some extent at least is true of Philo. Some of his explanations he definitely puts forward as new, as tentative, which others will perhaps be able to better.

Both writers alike reproduce the substance of the prophetic teaching, while thinking in the category of gift. What God can accept is not material gifts external to the man's self, but only the man's unblemished self, i.e. the man's will conformed to God. The high priest of the new religion must, like the high priest of the old, have something to present to God; yet that gift is himself, and in giving it he fulfilled the ideal of the prophetic Psalmist that what is required is not a material offering but the doing of the will of God. I was drawing attention last time to certain aspects of religion in the first century that indicated a rather low regard for the sacred gifts, the tendency to interpret them mainly in money value and to make use of them for trivial ends. But that was of course only one aspect of the religion. Alongside of this, alongside also of the perhaps rather deadening influence of treating all ritual as so much unexplained and uninterpreted service to be carried out merely because a matter of commandment, there

was alike in the old and the new religion an approximation of the prophetic spiritualization of the idea of gift to God. It is remarkable how the great prophetic sayings are used alike by our Lord, by the early Christian writers, and by certain Jewish Rabbis. As Philo had prepared the way for the loss of material sacrifice, so when that time actually comes Johanan b. Zakkai was able to prove by an appeal to the prophets that the loss touched nothing essential to religion: in his great and famous reply to R. Joshua's lament, 'Woe to us! for the place wherein the sins of Israel were expiated is destroyed', he replied: 'We still have a means of expiation of equal value, viz. the practice of kindness, for it is said, "For I will have kindness and not offering".'

This reply brings us to the last point I can touch upon. It is often suggested that the idea of gift is necessarily associated with expiation and propitiation. Of the association of gift and expiation the remark of Johanan just cited is one illustration: the Epistle to the Hebrews furnishes many more. Of the strength of the expiatory element in the religion of the first century there is no room for doubt; whether as distinct from this the propitiatory element is as great as some writers represent is another question. Whether gifts to the gods in the first instance spring out of a desire to propitiate them or a desire to commune with them is a question belonging to origins which I have deliberately left aside. But if we once again turn to the Jewish religion of historical times we certainly find that the associations of the gifts with expiation and propitiation are not constant and exclusive; the eucharistic element is prominent in, for example, Deuteronomy, it is also so in Philo; the gifts to God are recognitions of his goodness. And alike whether the gifts were expiatory, propitiatory, or eucharistic, there is, if not at all times a steady and continuous, yet a recurrent tendency manifest at the last as well as at certain other periods to spiritualize the conception of the gift.

I have now completed so far as has been possible an examination of one aspect of the Hebrew sacrificial system. There are other aspects, and in particular the points to which I have last alluded require in any comprehensive treatment separate and detached discussion. I selected the particular aspect I have

treated because it appeared to me that certain recent investigations and discussions have somewhat obscured it. It is not in my judgement of great moment for an understanding of historical Hebrew and Jewish religion and their contribution to Christian thought to determine whether Jewish sacrifice originated in the idea of communion or the idea of gifts to God, nor to discuss whether at various periods the type of sacrifice which may with most probability be most closely related to an original conception of communion is dominant or not. The truth is whatever is the root idea, if either is so exclusively, that root idea belongs to a grossly material view of religion and of man's relation to God. It was just as little possible for a growingly ethical and spiritual religion to revert to the earliest idea of communion as to the earliest idea of gift; both alike run back to a materialistic conception of God or the God, to the thought that the gods like men eat and drink. I have argued that the conception of sacrifices as gifts to God was vital, perhaps at its most vital, in the first century; but nothing could be more misleading than to say that the religion had moved away from the early conception of sacrifice as communion to a later conception of sacrifice as propitiatory gift. This would be to represent it as a descent. On the other hand the real movement is of course upward. The belief that God receives material gifts from man for his own use, the religion abandons; but its progress was not merely negative. It rises to the conception that there is a gift which man can make to God, a gift of something that is his own and that God desires to receive; man can give himself; his will is his own, he can make it his present to God. But this is also to say that through the idea of gift spiritualized the idea of communion is reached—not the material communion of primitive thought, but communion of spirit. Thus in reaching this point, even in the realm of sacrificial thought, the religion has travelled the whole way from a prehistoric, material starting-point through stages where the material still exercises its influence, particularly in maintaining a ritual of which the original meaning had been outgrown, to a completely spiritual goal.

# IV

## SACRIFICE, PROPITIATION, AND EXPIATION

### i

In the lectures which I gave last year on the subject of Jewish sacrifice, I had more than one opportunity of insisting on a point of view that appears to me to be important, viz. that while it is valuable and instructive to trace back, if we can, Jewish sacrificial customs to their origin, and to determine the idea or thought out of which they originally sprang, such investigations ought not to take the place of, but in a discussion of Jewish sacrifice should merely be used to promote and assist, the inquiry as to what at various periods Jewish sacrificial custom was, how much of it had ceased to express living religious thought and had become merely *opus operatum*, and, most important of all, what at a given period was the thought or purpose associated with customs inherited from the past and in many cases from a remote past. From this point of view I hope in the lectures of this term to deal with the relation between sacrifice and propitiation; it will not in this connexion be final to prove that sacrifice did or did not spring out of a desire to propitiate a divine being or beings; what has to be attempted is to determine how far and how closely at different periods, in the history of Jewish religion, sacrificial custom and the idea of propitiation were associated. Even if propitiation was the original idea that gave rise to sacrificial custom, yet if the religion had increasingly subordinated this idea in connexion with sacrifice and had ultimately divorced them, then the association of propitiation and sacrifice in Christian thought could not safely be traced to a Jewish origin; and similarly with the idea of communion and fellowship in Christian thought. For the highly important question of the Jewish contributions to Christian thought and doctrine it is pre-eminently important

to maintain with all distinctness the difference between the original idea of sacrifice, if it can be determined, and the ideas which in the course of history came to be most closely or most widely associated with sacrificial custom.

In the last three lectures I was examining into the connexion of sacrifice and gift, into the extent to which sacrifices were conceived as gifts, into the relation of sacrifices to sacred gifts which are commonly not regarded and cannot conveniently be identified with sacrifices, and into the action and reaction on one another of the thought that sacrifices are gifts to God and the thought that all that man has are God's gift to man.

The course then covered opens the way for the present examination; and I note at once these two points in general: first, sacrifices that were conceived as gifts *might* at the same time be regarded as propitiatory; second, that in some Jewish sacrifices that which is more than or other than a gift may be a propitiatory element. I put both points at present merely as possibilities.

The main question to which we seek an answer is this: To what extent did Hebrew sacrifice directly spring out of, or continue to be consciously and directly associated with, the desire to arrest or prevent the displeasure of God? To what extent at various periods were sacrifices offered with a view to removing conditions in man, whether physical or ethical, that roused the hostility of God and so involved man in danger?

Terminology and traditional phraseology, if they speak clearly, carry us far behind the earliest literary sources in which they occur, and in some cases are the most valuable evidence available for approximating to *origins*. At the same time terminology by itself is primarily evidence for the ideas of the age that created it; the continued use of terminology is not by itself proof that the ideas that created it also maintained themselves, or at least no evidence that they maintained themselves with their original vitality. If it were the case that ancient Hebrew sacrificial terminology largely pointed to the idea of propitiation as its source, this would be most important evidence of the actual prominence of propitiation in connexion with sacrifice *originally*, but not necessarily of the maintenance of the connexion of propitiation and sacrifice. On the other

hand, if it can be shown that a fresh terminology resting on the idea of propitiation was created or adapted at a given period, this may be important evidence for the strength of the idea at the period in question, though from the nature of the case it is not evidence for the original connexion of the two.

In the survey of sacrificial terminology in my last lectures I pointed out the extent to which the *general* terms for sacrifices arose out of the idea of gift, and to which the *special* terms referred to something in the manner or ritual of the sacrifice—to its being slain, or burnt in the fire, ascending wholly or in part on the altar, and so forth. The number of terms which refer to the *cause* or *purpose* of sacrifice is small; but it includes two—חטאת and אשם—which clearly require examination in the present connexion; a third—אשה—on one interpretation would also be important if the view that has been suggested of its etymology were correct; but I showed last year[1] that it is at least altogether uncertain whether אשה, which is commonly understood to mean 'an offering made by fire', meant originally 'a means of establishing favourable relations with God', and I shall not return to the subject now except to recall this fact, that *if* אשה originally meant a means of establishing friendly relations, all sense of this meaning seems to have been forgotten before the age of the literature which preserves the term for us. There is another term used in connexion with sacrifice which must be discussed, and that is the verb כפר, which is commonly rendered in E.V. 'to atone' or 'to make atonement for'.

The precise distinction between the sin-offering and the guilt- or trespass-offering is not altogether clear, and has been much discussed, but that need not detain us here. We are for the moment concerned with the broad general meanings of the terms, and that is unambiguous and quite perspicuous. Each of these terms when used as the names of special offerings is used in a derived sense; the fundamental meanings of the terms חטאת and אשם are respectively 'sin' and 'trespass', or invasion of the rights of another; the latter term אשם is indeed scarcely used in Hebrew in its fundamental sense, but it occurs in an intermediate meaning, viz. the guilt incurred by trespass (Gen. $26^{10}$); on the other hand, חטאת meaning sin (and not sin-offering)

[1] [See ch. 1, pp. 9 ff.]

occurs with great frequency. The relation between the fundamental and derived might perhaps be explained by such a development of meaning as we find for example in בשורה; this in e. g. 2 Sam. $18^{20}$ means 'good tidings', but in 2 Sam. $4^{10}$ it means the reward or payment for good tidings; أثم, the Arabic equivalent of אשם, which frequently in the Koran means 'sin', for example, ii. 216, 'Drinking and dicing are great sins', in xxv. 68 means the reward, recompense, or punishment of sin—'Whosoever does this shall receive (the reward of) sin (أثاما); double unto him shall be the torment in the day of resurrection.' In this case אשם and חטאת as applied to offerings imply that certain sins and trespasses could be paid off; the sin-offering and the guilt-offering would in this case be payments for sin taking the form of an offering; when the payment was duly made, the sin or trespass was discharged, and the sinner acquitted or out of debt in this respect. In this connexion we should note that the *'āshām* was specially offered in cases where God or man had been wronged in such a manner that the wrong done was capable of being assessed in money; for example, if a man through negligence failed to pay a sacred due, such e. g. as first-fruits, he withheld from God something of a definite and easily ascertained value; to put himself in the right for his negligence (for if the failure to pay had been wilful it involved much more serious consequences) he had (1) to give the full value of what he had withheld plus a fifth of that value; and (2) to offer an animal at the altar as an *'āshām*, 'trespass(-offering)' (Lev. $5^{14-16}$). In this case the *'āshām* might be looked upon in some measure as part of the payment for the offence, for both restitution of the goods due, together with the fine and offering, are made to God; moreover, it is provided that the animal offered as an *'āshām* must be of a certain money value; in the cases dealt with in Lev. $5^{16, 18}$ it is provided that the animal offered as an *'āshām* must be a ram 'of the value of shekels at least, according to thy (i. e. the priest's) valuation by the shekel of the sanctuary' (cp. Zeb. x. 5). But that the *'āshām* was not merely a paying off of a debt, though this element in it may have been originally exclusive and always predominant, is seen in cases where the wrong done and the debt consequently due was primarily wrong done and debt due to man. In this

case the property wrongfully held is restored to its rightful human owner plus a fifth of its value; for instance, if a man find lost property and retain it without endeavouring to find its rightful owner, and subsequently wishes to put himself in the right, he must restore the property plus a fifth of its value to the owner and at the same time offer an animal at the altar as a guilt-offering to God. Here, therefore, the guilt-offering is something given or ritually presented to God on the occasion of restoring in full his property to one's neighbour.

We may observe the possible nuance attaching to the term חטאת when used of an offering for sin in another way; it is at least possible that it is closely connected with the use of the same term in ritual connexions which yet have nothing to do with sacrifice proper. In Num. $8^{5ff.}$ we have an account of the presentation of the Levites to Yahweh; it is there prescribed that the preparatory purification is to be secured by sprinkling upon them מי חטאת, which phrase rendered simply word by word is 'water of sin', but it is obvious that חטאת is here used pregnantly or with a derivative meaning such as 'a means for the removal of sin', and the R.V. very properly renders the phrase not by 'water of sin' but by 'water of expiation'—'And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: sprinkle the water of expiation upon them'. Again in Num. 19 we have an account of the way in which uncleanness incurred by contact with dead bodies was to be removed; this was achieved mainly by washing with water into which had been cast the ashes of a red cow that had been burnt, *not on the altar* but without the camp. As to these ashes we read in v. 9: 'And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the cow, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of Israel for water for (removing) impurity; it is חטאת.' Now obviously חטאת cannot be here rendered sin; the ashes of the cow were not sin; but it is equally clear that the R.V. which renders 'a sin-offering' is altogether misleading. It may be that the ritual of the red cow rests on or is the survival of some primitive rite that really was a sacrifice or sacred offering; but it is certain that the Jewish ritual is not the ritual of sacrifice; the red cow was not sacrificed on Yahweh's altar, nor was it in any other way ever presented or offered

to Yahweh; it is not therefore a sin-*offering*, but it is a means for the removal of sin; it is not an expiatory offering, but it is an expiatory object (Greek ἄγνισμα). On the analogy of their own rendering in Num. $8^{5ff.}$ which I cited just now the Revisers might well have rendered 'it is an expiatory object', rather than by the misleading phrase 'it is a sin-offering'.

But whereas the term חטאת in the ritual of the red cow does not denote a sin-*offering*, its use in that ritual may cast light on the real flavour of the term חטאת when it is used of what was presented to Yahweh and burnt on his altar, i. e. when it is used of what is customarily called a sin-offering. The term חטאת does not, as I have repeatedly observed, primarily contain the idea of offering; it may well be, then, that when it was applied to certain victims slain before and burnt on Yahweh's altar, it did not so much refer to the fact that they were *offerings to Yahweh* as that they were victims by means of which the sins of the men who offered them were removed, whether in virtue either of the gift of the animal to God, or of some element in the ritual disposition of it; and to take a single instance, it may well be that we should do more justice to the actual thought of the framers of the ritual if in such a passage as Lev. $4^{8}$ we were to render the phrase פר החטאת not as in E.V. by 'the bullock of the sin-offering' but by 'the bullock slain for the removal of sin', on the analogy of the phrase 'water for the removal of sin' to which I have already referred.

By a mere examination of the terms alone it is not possible to determine the precise nature of the derivative meanings that came to be attached to them; the terms must be taken in the entire setting of thought and theory which other evidence enables us to recover for them. But enough has already been adduced to illustrate how the terms חטאת and אשם are associated with ideas of propitiation, or rather of expiation. The question now arises to whom are these terms due? Were they created by the framer of the Levitical law? Are they part of the Mosaic tradition? Do they, therefore, reflect an element in the Mosaic conception or theory of sacrifice? Or are they the creation of a much later period in the history of the Jewish religion? In particular ought we to see in them one sign of the transition from happier associations of sacrifice in early

Israel to the more sombre associations of later post-exilic sacrifice?

A correct view of the history of the terms perhaps lies between the two extremes just indicated. On the one hand it is a fact that the terms חטאת and אשם as applied to animal victims presented on Yahweh's altar are confined in the O.T. to Ezekiel, the Priestly parts of the Pentateuch (H and P), Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; and therefore if we accept the view that the Priestly Code is post-exilic these terms occur exclusively in the exilic and post-exilic parts of the O.T., though there they occur with great frequency, as they do in some later, extra-canonical Jewish writings.[1]

Yet we cannot infer from this, at least immediately, that Ezekiel was the first Jew to speak of sacrificial victims by the name of חטאת. We must, on the other hand, give due weight to three considerations: (1) 2 Ki. 12, in a passage commonly regarded as derived from a pre-exilic source, tells the story of the restoration of the Temple in the days of Jehoash at the end of the ninth century (*c.* 816–800 B.C.). Money for the purpose was collected in a money-box placed beside the altar; when the box grew heavy it was opened by an officer of the king and by the high priest and paid over to the workmen engaged in the restoration. The narrative closes with the express statement that certain moneys were not put into the money-box nor used for the repair of the Temple, but were retained by the priests in accordance, as we must infer, with what was already a custom of long standing. These moneys are termed כסף אשם and (MT יות, LXX) כסף חטאת, literally 'silver of guilt' and 'silver of sin'. The Hebrew phrases are rendered in the E.V. 'the money for guilt-offerings' and 'the money for sin-offerings', as though the moneys in question were intended to purchase victims to be

[1] Hos. $4^8$ is not an exception. If, indeed, the words 'They (i.e. the Priests) feed upon the חטאת of my people' stood alone, it would be tempting to see in them an allusion to the right of the priests, as it existed later, to use as food parts of some of the victims slain for sin (Lev. $6^{19}$ (E.V.$^{26}$)). But these words do not stand alone; they stand in parallelism with: 'and set their heart on their iniquity (עון)'; the meaning is that the priests encourage the people in a false view of sacrifice that thereby they may derive profit from the multiplication not only of one special kind but of all kinds of sacrifice. Cp. Hos. $8^{11}$.

burnt on the altar as sin-offerings and guilt-offerings. If this were correct we should have an early direct reference to sin-offerings and guilt-offerings such as appear so frequently in post-exilic literature. But it is now commonly and rightly recognized that this is not correct: the passage makes no allusion to sacrificial victims, but to money payments for ritual offences. The passage does not refer to sin-offerings, but at the same time it by no means proves that such were unknown at the time. It was germane to the story to refer to money; it was not germane to the story to refer to sacrifices. Later in the Priestly Code the guilt-offering accompanied restitution; it may be that in the time of Jehoash the money of guilt, corresponding to the restitution of later law and practice, was accompanied by sacrifice. It *may* be; the story in Kings leaves the question open, neither proving, nor disproving, the custom of bringing a sacrifice when making a material recompense for a ritual offence.

With the use of both חטאת and אשם in reference to money payments for ritual offences we may recall the use of אשם in the story of the return of the ark by its Philistine captors. The capture of the ark was obviously an invasion of the rights of Yahweh; and by their question to their priests and diviners, when they are anxious to be rid of a sacred object which had caused them great inconvenience, the Philistines show themselves aware of the necessity of sending back with the ark some material reparation; 'with what shall we send it back?' is their question. The priests reply: 'do not send (back) the ark without anything (ריקם: cp. ye shall not see my face (ריקם), but by all means render (or pay—השב תשיבו) to him (i. e. Yahweh) an *'āshām*'.[1] The *'āshām* in this case consists of certain golden objects; these are sent away with the ark on a new cart drawn by cows; when the cart reaches the spot in Yahweh's country where it is to stay we must suppose, though the narrative does not clearly or explicitly state this, that the *'āshām* was received by or on behalf of Yahweh. But what the narrative does explicitly state at the close of the story is interesting; the cows which had drawn the cart and which had been carefully selected by the Philistines are slain and offered up to

[1] 1 Sam. $6^3$.

Yahweh as a *burnt*-offering, and when the Philistines had seen, viz. the acceptance of the *'āshām* and the sacrifice of their cows, they returned home. We find then in this narrative that the *'āshām* was at times at least accompanied by sacrifice, but that in this earlier period this accompanying sacrifice was termed a burnt-offering, not as in the law a sin-offering.

(2) I turn now to consider the bearing on our question of the terminology of certain South Arabian inscriptions. Among the Sabaean inscriptions are a group, pre-Christian doubtless, but of how much greater antiquity it is doubtful, which closely resemble the Greek exemplaria collected in Phrygia and brought together by Professor Ramsay in his *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, pp. 149 ff. What he says of these Greek inscriptions applies almost as well to the Sabaean; he says (p. 134): 'In inscriptions of this class the authors are represented as having approached the *hieron* or engaged in the services of the deity which followed some physical or moral impurity . . . they are chastised by the god . . . they confess and acknowledge their fault; they appease the god by (sacrifices) and expiation; they are freed by him from their chastisement; and finally they narrate the whole in a public inscription as a warning to all not to treat the god lightly.'[1]

From these inscriptions Hommel in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* draws the conclusion that the ritual term Khaṭ'at, 'sin-offering', existed in South Arabia from the ancient Minaean period, a period which on Hommel's theory runs back to beyond 1000 B.C. But the conclusion rests on a series of hypotheses, and principally these, (1) that a technical term which is attested a century or two B.C. must have existed also 1000 years or so earlier; and (2) that חטאת in the Mugilat inscription must not only be of the Pi'el or second conjugation, in which he is probably right, but that it must also mean in particular 'offer a sin-offering': it may simply mean like the Hebrew חטא 'to un-sin', 'to eliminate', whatever the precise means of achieving this in any particular case may be.

The Sabaean inscriptions remain an interesting parallel to certain Hebrew usages of חטא and its derivatives, but they do

[1] See Appendix A.

not prove that Sabaean actually possessed the name חטאת as a term for 'sin-offering', still less of course that Hebrew possessed such a term at an early period.

Neither the pre-exilic use of the terms חטאת and אשם in the O.T. nor the terminology of the South Arabian inscriptions permit us to affirm that sacrifices of animal victims under the terms used with the ritual described in the Priestly Code were made before the exile. But it remains to consider—

(3) What follows from Ezekiel's use of the terms. Both terms are confined to the final section of the Book (40–8) written in the year 572, i.e. twenty-five years after Ezekiel with Jehoiachin went into captivity and fifteen years after the fall of Jerusalem. Both terms are referred to in four passages ($40^{39}$, $42^{13}$, $44^{29}$, $46^{20}$); the חטאת in three other passages $43^{19-25}$, $44^{27}$, $45^{17-25}$. The first of these passages, like so many others in Ezekiel, is corrupt, and different efforts have been made to reconstruct the original out of the differing texts of MT and LXX. I need not enter into this textual question here, for whatever form of the text we adopt its chief significance for our present purpose remains essentially the same. I adopt here the most readily intelligible reconstruction of the text which runs: 'In the vestibule (of the future Temple seen in vision by Ezekiel) of the gateway there were two tables on each side on which the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings were slain; outside the door of the gateway on the north were two tables, and on the other side of the vestibule of the gateway two tables on which the peace-offerings were slain; and opposite the peace-offering tables were four tables for the burnt-offerings' (Ezek. $40^{39-42}$, cp. Toy and Bertholet). Now the chief point to observe here is that the sin-offerings and guilt-offerings stand alongside of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings as things equally familiar; Ezekiel does not hesitate elsewhere to note the novelty of such variations from ancient practice as he introduces; he leaves us for example in no doubt that the distinction between the sons of Zadok and other priests which he would introduce in the future had not been a feature of life before the fall of Jerusalem; since now he gives not the slightest indication that sin-offerings and guilt-offerings were something new and additional to the ancient peace-offerings and burnt-offerings, we may

surmise that they were known at least some time prior to the fall of Jerusalem. If the text adopted above be correct, another point of interest emerges; the four sorts of offerings fall into *three* classes (as they do in Philo): (1) Burnt-offerings; (2) Peace-offerings; (3) Guilt- and Sin-offerings.

This threefold division corresponds to a threefold method (regarded from the priestly standpoint) of disposing of the flesh of the sacrificial victims: of the burnt-offering the priests ate nothing, of the peace-offering they ate only certain joints received by them as a due before the remainder of the flesh was returned to the bringer of the offering, of the sin- and guilt-offerings they ate *all* except certain small portions which were burnt on the altar. The different disposition of the flesh in the case of whole- or burnt-offering and the peace-offering was ancient custom attested no less by early Hebrew literature than by the later—in particular by P and the Mishnah. But the fact that the sin- and guilt-offerings were to be eaten by the priests though they could not be eaten by the laity is first *attested* by Ezekiel. Was Ezekiel, then, the creator of this distinction? Can the argument from silence be invoked to prove that he was? Once again this seems to me doubtful, and for two reasons: (1) none of the allusions in Ezekiel to this disposition of these offerings suggests novelty; the first occurs in the account of the endowment of the priesthood; Yahweh says to Ezekiel of the priests: 'They shall have no (landed) inheritance, I am their inheritance, ye shall give them no possession in Israel; I am their possession. The cereal-offering and the sin-offering and the guilt-offering, these shall they eat, and every devoted thing in Israel shall be theirs' and so forth (Ezek. $44^{28\,f.}$). Other allusions to the eating of sin- and guilt-offerings occur in $46^{20}$ which defines the place where the sin-offerings are to be boiled; and $42^{13}$ which defines the place where the priests are to *eat* these offerings; (2) there is no earlier *priestly* treatment of sacrifice than Ezekiel's, and from the standpoint of the laity in reference to the disposal of the sacrificial victim, sacrifices, both first and last, fell into two and not into three classes: sacrifices for the layman after the exile no less than before it consisted *either* of sacrifices of the flesh of which he partook, or of sacrifices of which he did not partake; or otherwise stated,

either of sacrifices which the giver brought to Yahweh and left entire at the altar to be disposed of as Yahweh might direct whether by being burnt entire on his altar or in the main consumed by his proxies the priests, or the sacrifices were animals which were brought entire to the altar and slain there, but of which after this ritual treatment the greater part was taken away again to be enjoyed by the giver and his friends.

The conclusions to which these various considerations seem to me to point are these: (1) The application of the terms חטאת and אשם to a particular class of victims from which the offerer parted wholly arose in priestly circles; (2) the terms embody a doctrine of the expiatory character and virtue of certain sacrifices; (3) in priestly circles this terminology already existed before the Exile and had been familiar to Ezekiel before he left Jerusalem in 597 B.C.; (4) certain important elements in the ritual of these sacrifices, such for example as ritual eating of them by the *priests*, had also become established before the Exile; but (5) we cannot from Hebrew literature more precisely trace the history of the differentiation of sin- and guilt-offerings from the burnt-offering, nor of the ritual by which they came to be distinguished. Nor again can we form any clear idea of the frequency with which such offerings were made before the Exile. If we wish to determine the strength of the association of the idea of expiation with sacrifice in early Israel we must turn, as I hope to do in the next lecture, to other considerations. But in estimating the strength of that association in later Israel and in the Judaism which Ezekiel did so much to create, and which in its turn created the conditions under which Christianity arose, it is important among other things to take account of the frequency with which, under the law, sin-offerings were required of individuals, and the prominence of the sin-offering in certain ceremonies of national import. The last point I shall have some opportunity of considering in the third lecture.

# V

## SACRIFICE, PROPITIATION, AND EXPIATION

### ii

THE nomenclature of sacrifice, as we have seen, expresses the *purpose* of sacrifice only to a relatively small extent, and consequently in a correspondingly small degree reflects the propitiatory or expiatory character of Jewish sacrifice. Two terms alone out of the many names that occur for classes or subclasses of sacrifices express an expiatory purpose or function; these two, the אשם and the חטאת, appear with frequency in the post-exilic literature of the Jews; they do not occur at all in pre-exilic literature, and though we may infer that the names were nevertheless current before the Exile, it is possible that sacrifices so named were first differentiated relatively late in the pre-exilic period, and then primarily in priestly circles; it is also possible, not to say highly probable, that as compared with the place which they occupied after the Exile, the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings played but a subordinate part in pre-exilic Jewish life.

But apart from the names there are of course other means of determining whether other, and what other, sacrifices besides the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings were offered with a propitiatory or expiatory purpose. And first there is the attachment to a law or description of sacrifice that it was made לְכַפֵּר, or as the E.V. commonly renders, 'to make atonement'. Our chief purpose at present is to observe the extent to which an 'atoning' purpose (I use the term 'atoning' quite provisionally and conventionally) is actually ascribed to sacrifices in the literature, and how far the literature in this respect corresponds to the prominence of 'atoning' virtues in the actual consciousness of the people at various periods. It is of quite secondary

importance to determine the original meaning of the root כפר, and I will refer to the controversy that has arisen on this subject briefly, and merely in order to bring out the degree of clearness with which the ideas of expiation or propitiation were expressed by the term throughout the history of Hebrew literature.

Earlier discussions of the term כפר start from the assumption that the root meant originally *to cover*, *to cover over*; and doubtless a large amount of the actual usage in the O.T. and later Jewish writings could be reasonably derived from such an origin, and in many places the original force of the word might be supposed to survive. For example, when the object of the verb is, as in Gen. $32^{21}$ (E.V.$^{20}$), a person, or more strictly the face of a person, who may be thought to consider he has a ground of anger or ill-feeling against another, it would be in accordance with Hebrew idiom, as we can trace it elsewhere, if the verb should mean *to cover*: 'to cover the face' of an angry or wronged person was a Hebrew way of saying to get an angry or wronged person to overlook the wrong committed and so to look again with favour upon the person who had committed the wrong. But כפר with a personal object is in literature of all periods rare; it is more commonly construed with the sins or the offences as the direct object, or with the sins or offences indicated in a prepositional phrase as the reason for which what was implied by כפר or atonement was required. Here again it would be quite in accordance with Hebrew modes of thought to speak of *covering* the sin or offence so as to make it henceforth without effect on the person who had committed the fault or on the wronged person. When the Psalmist[1] speaks of the man 'whose sin is covered', he uses not the verb כפר, but the verb כסה, which beyond question means 'to cover'. To cover a wronged person's face so as to appease him, to cover a sin so as to make it inoperative, are both unquestionably Hebrew ideas whether they were ever expressed by means of כפר and its derivatives or not. One further point before I turn from the possibility that 'to cover' was the original meaning of the root כפר, and the meaning which at times at least continued to be, or, if not original, came to be associated with it. In Jer. $18^{23}$ E.V. reads: 'Forgive not their iniquity,

[1] [Ps. $32^{1}$.]

neither blot out their sin from thy sight'; the Hebrew rendered 'forgive' is תכפר על; this petition is repeated with slight alteration in Neh. $3^{37}$ (E.V. $4^5$), which is rendered in E.V.: 'Cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee'; in the later passage אל תְּכַס, which unmistakably means, 'Do not cover over', is substituted for אל תכפר in the earlier.

The O.T. usage of כפר and its derivatives on the assumption that the fundamental meaning was 'to cover'[1] was elaborately discussed by Schmoller in an article in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1891 (pp. 205 ff.); and this theory, to which in theological circles Ritschl's great work on Atonement had given powerful support, for long dominated discussion. It was, for example, still put forward, though with some reserve, by Dr. Driver in his article on Propitiation in Hastings's *Dictionary* in 1902. But the theory did not completely hold the field even then; as early as 1881 W. R. Smith (*OTJC*[1], 380f., 438f.[2],) had argued that the original meaning of כפר was to wipe away. And in favour of this it could be urged that in O.T. usage unambiguous words for wiping away sin occur (מחה), and that at times these stand as in Jer. $18^{23}$, which I have just cited in parallelism with כפר. Outside Hebrew usage the supporters of the theory that 'to cover' is the fundamental meaning found confirmation of their theory in Arabic, the supporters of the alternative theory, that it meant 'to wipe away', in Syriac.

This, like so many other questions, was raised by closer comparison of Hebrew with Babylonian terminology. It will be convenient to cite here Zimmern's words in *KAT*[3], p. 601 f.: 'Apart from the actual offerings we find in Babylonian ritual texts numerous rites directed towards securing expiation or general ritual purification. Some of these must be expressly mentioned on account of the technical terms used in connexion with them, because these terms are identical with words occurring in the Old Testament ritual. One of the chief functions undertaken by the *âsipu*, i.e. the priests who recited incantations and performed rites of atonement, was that of securing *kuppuru* (Inf. Pi'el, with the corresponding substantive *takpirtu*), i.e. the washing away (of filth—Schmutz) with a view to lustration. This *kuppuru* is carried out both on persons and on things

[1] So We, *Comp.* 335 f.

This technical term *kuppuru* used in the Babylonian ritual of atonement is certainly identical with the Hebrew כפר, the technical designation for "atonement" in the Priestly language; moreover, the Babylonian meaning secures for the Hebrew word also the fundamental meaning of "wiping away", though that fundamental meaning was no longer completely felt in usage. It is further very probable that the Hebrew כפר as a specific expression of ritual technic and with the meaning "to atone" (*sühnen*), is not genuinely Hebrew, but was adopted from the Babylonian ritual and technical use of *kuppuru.*'

There are two main points in Zimmern's remarks: (1) that the technical term כפר was borrowed by the Jews from the Babylonians, i.e. was carried over from Babylonian into Jewish ritual: and (2) that in Babylonian and, in consequence of (1), in Hebrew also, the fundamental meaning out of which this technical expression developed was 'to wipe away'.

Babylonian thus appeared to range with Syriac, and, if correctly interpreted, as a far more powerful supporter in favour of the theory that the root meaning of כפר in Hebrew was 'to wipe away', and against the theory that it meant 'to cover'.

Provoked by what seemed to him an illegitimate application of Babylonian learning and a mistaken method in a semasiological discussion, Dr. König in the *Expository Times*, xxii (1910-11). 232-4, re-examined the O.T. usage of כפר, and endeavoured to relate various uses to the assumed fundamental meaning 'to cover'. His article contains some searching criticism of the competing theory that the fundamental meaning is 'to wipe away', and he had no more difficulty than his predecessors in offering a reasonable explanation of many occurrences of the term on the assumption that the fundamental meaning was 'to cover'; at times he is less convincing; that *kᵉphor*, 'hoar-frost', was so named because it *covered* the ground is a suggestion that can only be accepted *faute de mieux*. König concluded in a very positive tone: 'Our conclusion then is that there is no reason upon the ground of the usage of other Semitic languages to give up the root idea of *kipper* which is established for Hebrew by irrefragable proofs. . . . When we read, then, of atoning for sin in the O.T. there is no need to think of any root idea except what has hitherto been accepted by O.T.

science, and no new light has been shed on the matter by the Babylon-Assyrian literature.'

To both points in this challenge—that כפר meant 'to cover' and that comparison with Babylonian was irrelevant—reply was made simultaneously by Dr. Burney and by Dr. Langdon in a later number of the same periodical; and their replies, so far as the fundamental meaning of the root was concerned, added two fresh theories. Dr. Burney's suggestion, based on the occurrence in a Babylonian syllabary of the term *kapâru* or *kuppuru* along with various words signifying bright or light as equivalents of the sun-ideogram, was that כפר meant originally to be white, or to glisten, *kᵉphor*, the hoar-frost, was what was white and glistened—a far likelier feature to give it its name than that it covered the ground; the phrase used in Genesis[1] of Esau and Jacob was literally 'I will brighten his face with a gift', and where 'sin' becomes the object of the transitive verb כפר, the idea is as in the familiar passage in Is. 1[18] that sin will be made white.

The value of Dr. Langdon's article rests more in the fullness with which he cites the technical ritual usages of the Babylonian *kuppuru*, &c., than in his theory of the original significance of the root. On this latter point he is not quite clear; but apparently he considers it to be 'to remove', though he couples this at times with the more precise 'wipe away' of earlier theories. Under his discussion of the Pi'el of the verb he does indeed speak quite clearly of the 'original sense', but I suppose means thereby the original sense of the Pi'el. However, I will quote the paragraph in full: of the Pi'el Dr. Langdon says that it is 'widely employed in the rituals for removing the bread, meal, water, sacrificial animal after the ceremony; these elements absorb the uncleanness of the person or object cleaned, and removing them purges, makes clean, hence *kuppuru* = purge, purify. Yet the original sense is "perform the ritual of purification by removing the magical elements"'. This is further illustrated by an instance given by Dr. Langdon later: 'In another text concerning a man in affliction, the priest makes an image of the afflicted person and places it at his feet at midnight: then *ina šeri zumur-šu kuppir-ma*, in the morning purges his body. The Sumerian for this passage preserves the

[1] [32[21] (E.V.[20]).]

original idea—"at the departure of darkness remove from his body", i.e. remove the clay image. We see precisely from this passage how the term began to pass from the notion of "remove" to purify by the ritual of a scapegoat, &c. The word cannot mean to "purify" except in this connection, a point to be kept in mind when we come to study the loan-word in Hebrew.'

Dr. König replied to both his opponents; but in his reply I will note only a single point which will forward our discussion. Dr. Langdon had claimed as against the theory that כפר meant 'to cover' that 'the idea of "covering" is never recognized in the Greek translation'. To this König retorted, 'But was it to be *expected* that a Greek translator should reproduce the original sense of the Hebrew verb?' The retort is not final. It is certainly not to be expected that a Greek translator should reproduce the original sense if that sense had been lost; on the other hand, if the idea of covering had been strongly felt it would be remarkable that the translator should invariably fail to suggest it. The value of the Greek evidence lies in this: that it proves that by the third century B. C. the idea of covering was not suggested to those who read the Levitical ritual when they came across the term כפר; for example, Lev. $4^{31}$ may have conveyed much the same idea to such a reader as does to the English reader the E.V. 'And the priest shall make atonement for him'; but it did not call up before him of necessity the picture either of his sin or of himself being covered over, or of his sin being wiped away, or of the sacrifice or sacrificial victim having first absorbed his sin being then removed (cp. Ecclus. $3^{30}$).

On the question of the *original* meaning of the Semitic root which gave *kuppuru* in Babylonian and כפר in Hebrew, Dr. Langdon somewhat modified his opinion in *Expiation (Babylonian)* in *ERE*. He there writes: 'In the ordinary ritual of atonement water, bread, grain, plants, and animal sacrifices are introduced . . . the priest seeks to drive the demons into the water, the bread, the grain, or whatsoever element may be employed. When he utters the curse the evil passes into the water, which is then taken away. . . . The technical term for putting the elements to the body is *tehû* (Sum. *teg*), and for removing them *kuppuru* (Sum. *gur*). The bread, water, plants,

&c., into which the curse had driven the powers of evil, are called *takpirtu*. *Kuppuru* then developed the sense of purge, purify, atone.'

In a note Dr. Langdon added: 'There is not the least doubt that the technical word for "atone" in Sumerian means "turn away, remove".' In regard to *kuppuru* the writer is of opinion that although the Babylonians employed this word with emphasis on the removing of the objects which had magically absorbed the curse and the uncleanness, the root meaning involves both the ideas of *cover* and *remove*. The Babylonian ritual gives us, we think, the clue for fixing the Semitic conception of atonement from which both Babylonian and Hebrew started. We take the root *kapâru* to mean fundamentally 'wash away with a liquid'.

But what we can affirm of readers in the third century B.C. we may, I believe, infer of the writers of the P.C. let us say about 500 B.C. A striking feature of the use of the verb in P.C. which has often been pointed out is that it very rarely takes a direct accusative after it. It is generally followed by the preposition על, or much more rarely by בעד. This fact is used by König in support of his theory; he argues that these prepositions might introduce the direct object of a verb meaning to cover, but could not introduce the object of verbs meaning to wipe away or to brighten; this may be admitted, and yet it does not follow, nor is it probable that the frequently recurring phrases in Leviticus ought to be rendered 'it shall cover over him or it'. Not only does the LXX not render the verb כפר by 'to cover' but it invariably translates the preposition by *περί*. This of course directly shows only how the translators understood the phrases. But in the P.C. itself we find one passage that is directly against König's view; in Lev. $16^{32}$ the verb is used absolutely; here obviously we can translate neither: 'And the priest shall cover', or 'wipe away', or 'brighten'. On the other hand, both here and in the numerous passages where it is construed with על and בעד it has, like the corresponding Babylonian term, acquired a technical sense; and the E.VV. are near the mark in translating in Lev. $16^{32}$, 'And the priest shall make an atonement', and in the other passages 'shall make atonement for them' or 'for it'.

Only one other question of detail need be discussed and that briefly here. The usage of the verb outside the ritual literature admits an object which is personal or one which defines the offence or sin; in the former, whatever the precise figure originally or even still expressed by the verb, it meant to propitiate, in the latter to expiate. The ideas of expiation of sin and propitiation of God are in Hebrew thought closely related; yet it is of some importance if possible to determine which was more directly suggested by the technical term. Did the term primarily mean to effect an atonement with or reconciliation of God, or to effect an expiation of the sin? The LXX may at first seem to favour the idea of propitiation, for that was doubtless the normal meaning of ἐξιλάσκομαι in classical Greek. But in the LXX itself this verb is sometimes construed not with an accusative of a person propitiated, but, as also in Heb. $2^{17}$, of an offence expiated. And Deissmann has been able to show that this is not mere Biblical Greek by citing an inscription containing the directions of the Lycian Xanthus for the sanctuary founded by him, in which it is said of certain offenders ἁμαρτίαν ὀφειλάτω Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξιλασάσθαι (*Bible Studies*, 225). In any case since in the P.C. the Hebrew verb is sometimes construed with an accusative of the thing that is in a state of sin, but never with God as an object,[1] it is more probable that 'to make expiation' is the most adequate rendering of כפר used in its technical sense and without a direct object, i.e. that is throughout Ezekiel and P; the sense to expiate also attaches to the verb in the earlier and later (Ecclus. $3^{30}$) literature when it is construed with an accusative of the sin, though the idea of propitiation obviously comes to the front in the rare examples of personal objects to the verb.

Expiation of sin, alike in earlier times, which are imperfectly,

[1] Test. Levi. $3^{6}$ is not an exception, and Dr. Charles translates the Greek text 'the archangels who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous'; it is tolerably certain that the Hebrew lying behind the Greek, as the Greek itself, did not construe כפר with a personal object; the Greek ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς Κύριον which suggests something like כפרים לנגד is obviously 'the archangels who make expiation in the presence of the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous', i.e. the heavenly service is represented in the Testaments as expiatory rather than propitiatory.

too imperfectly reflected for us in the earlier narratives, the earlier laws and the prophets, and in later times dominated by Ezekiel and the P.C., was achieved partly by sacrifice, partly in other ways; and when by sacrifice, partly in later times, but even then not wholly, by the particular species of sacrifice which we considered in the last lecture—the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings. Expiatory virtue is, however, also ascribed in P.C. by the use of the term כפר to the following as well as to sin-offerings and guilt-offerings: (1) Burnt-offerings, of which it is said in Lev. $1^4$ that they are to be accepted for those who offer them לכפר עליו, to make expiation for them; cp. $14^{20}$, $16^{24}$, Ezek. $45^{15-17}$ (coupled with peace-offerings and meal-offerings); (2) to that ram in the service for the consecration of the priests (Ex. $29^{33}$) which was not a burnt-offering, but which was treated as, though not termed, a peace-offering; on the other hand, in the ritual of the peace-offering in Lev. 3 expiatory virtue is not expressly attributed to the sacrifice (cp. the meal-offering in ch. 2); (3) the ritual for cleansing a leprous house by means of two birds and other things (*not* a sacrifice)[1]; (4) to the fumes of incense made in Aaron's censer by fire taken off the altar and carried by him among the people stricken for their murmuring (Num. $17^{11\,f.}$, E.V. $16^{46\,f.}$); (5) the putting to death by Phineas of the Israelite who had brought a Midianitish woman into the camp and of the woman herself[2]; (6) the half-shekel paid by each Israelite as a ransom for his life: this is said לכפר על נפשותיהם and is called כסף הכפרים (E.V. atonement-money) Ex. $30^{15\,f.}$; (7) the ornaments of precious metal rifled from the bodies of the Midianites who were slain to a man by 12,000 Israelites under Phineas; these ornaments were presented as a קרבן to make expiation for the sins of the warriors (Midrash), Num. $31^{50}$; (8) the blood of a man-slayer can alone expiate the blood he has shed: Num. $35^{33}$; (9) in Num. $8^{19}$ the Levites are regarded as a kind of permanent expiation for the entire body of the Israelites: if a lay Israelite approached the holy objects, even to render menial services in connexion with them, he must perish: the Levites by being set apart to perform these services expiated the lay Israelites by freeing them from the necessity of touching holy objects. I have kept to the last of this

[1] [Lev. $14^{53}$.] [2] [Num. $25^{13}$.]

catalogue what is in some ways the most general statement of the means of expiation in relation to the sacrificial system: this (10) is the blood of sacrifices without distinction of kind: no blood of any kind might be eaten, for 'blood upon the altar', i.e. sacrificial blood of any kind, has been appointed to Israel by God as the means of expiation: Lev. $17^{11}$. With this general expiatory character attributed to all sacrificial blood, we may compare the expiatory character attributed to *all* sacrifices in Ezek. $45^{15-17}$—he shall prepare the sin-offering and the meal-offering and the burnt-offering and the peace-offering to make expiation for the house of Israel. ✓

From this preliminary survey of the means of expiation in P I select at present (for I hope to return to a fuller discussion in a later lecture) three general facts for remark: (1) Sacrifice is not the only means of expiation recognized, nor are the other means confined to non-sacrificial blood: it is not absolutely true (as Heb. $9^{22}$ recognizes) of P that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins; but (2) the non-sacrificial means of expiation of actual sins are relatively unimportant, so that the Rabbinic dictum אין כפרה אלא בדם (B. Yoma 5a), though less accurate than the safeguarded statement of the Epistle to the Hebrews, correctly emphasizes what is practically predominant; (3) broadly speaking, the sacrificial system as a whole is expiatory: all sacrifices in Ezekiel, the blood of all sacrifices in P expiate; but (4) the expiatory virtue was more directly and explicitly connected in the law and was probably in life more strongly felt in connexion with some sacrifices than with others: in the ritual of the burnt-offerings and the sin-offerings and guilt-offerings the expiatory virtue is expressed by the clause לכפר; in the ritual of the meal-offering (Lev. 2) and peace-offering it is not.

The term כפר so frequent in the Priestly Ritual is of ancient origin, though as we have seen the usage in the earlier and later literature, or in the priestly and non-priestly literature, shows certain differences. There is another ancient term of frequent occurrence in the P.C. and used to define the purpose of sacrifice. This is לריח ניחח לי" which is rendered in the E.V. for 'a sweet savour unto the Lord'—a rendering which rests on the LXX ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας. It is an interesting question whether

the substitution for this rendering of one that more closely renders the *original* meaning of the Hebrew phrase better represents the theory of the effect of sacrifice held by the framers or authors of P. In other words it is a question whether we ought to seek the interpretation of this phrase as used in P in its etymology and its use in the single passage where it occurs in early Hebrew literature or in the Greek rendering. If in P it retained its original meaning, then the Greek rendering is a paraphrase and on that account the more significant of the thought of the Alexandrian translators. In any case, therefore, an examination of this phrase and the Greek rendering promises some insight into the ebb and flow of certain sacrificial conceptions in different periods or different local expressions of Jewish thought.

Etymologically ריח ניחח means 'a rest-giving smell', and so where the phrase ליהוה is added 'a smell that quiets the anger of Yahweh' or placates him. 'A soothing odour' suggested in the recent English commentaries on Exodus and Leviticus is, therefore, an excellent translation of the phrase in any passage where the original meaning survives. And such a passage we find beyond question in the one early passage in which the phrase occurs: 'And Yahweh smelled the soothing odour; and Yahweh said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake . . . neither again will I smite every living thing as I have done.'[1] The entire context shows that the odour is thought of as soothing and placating: the crude and materialistic description of the sensuous enjoyment of the gods, which still stands in the Babylonian original of the Hebrew story, is tempered in the Hebrew, but the Hebrew still stands near enough to its origin for the soothing and placating of God to express itself in the phrase as well as in the words that follow. This use of the phrase is due to J—let us say to the ninth century B.C.

It is more surprising to find the phrase reappearing with apparently much of its original force in Lev. $26^{31}$ (H, not P)—in the paraenetic close of H: 'I will make your cities a waste, and I will bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell your soothing odours. And I will bring the land unto

[1] [Gen. $8^{21}$.]

desolation', &c. If the term 'soothing odours' here retains its full force then the whole clause means that Yahweh will destroy, allowing nothing to placate: if, however, its original force was already weakening, the clause may be little more than a synonym of that which precedes, the point being that the sanctuaries will be laid waste, and the sacrificial service cease.

Ezekiel in his use of the phrase anticipates P less closely than often. He never clearly uses it to define the purpose of offerings to *Yahweh*: in three of the four passages where he uses the phrase he uses it of sacrifices offered to *idols*: in one of these the sense of placating or appeasing may have been strongly felt, for it is coupled with a reference to the sacrifice of children: 'My bread which I gave thee, the fine flour and oil and honey, wherewith I fed thee, thou settest before them as a soothing odour, says the Lord, Yahweh. Thou tookest thy sons and thy daughters whom thou barest me, and them thou didst sacrifice unto them to be devoured' ($16^{19}$, cp. $6^{13}$, $20^{28}$). The one passage ($20^{41}$) where the phrase is associated with Yahweh is unfortunately not altogether clear; and it is difficult to say whether the sense of soothing or placating was strongly felt in the phrase as used there or not.

P certainly uses antique phrases with weakened force: for example when he speaks of the sacrifices as the food of God no one supposes that he still thought, as the early creators of the phrase doubtless did, that God ate the sacrificial flesh and blood. In the same way it is possible that when he says of sacrifices that they afford to Yahweh a ריח ניחח he does not mean that the smell of them soothes his anger and placates him. If, however, the ancient phrase vividly retains for him its etymological meaning that is what he means, and in that case the propitiatory object of sacrifice is as directly and as repeatedly expressed in the ritual as is its expiatory purpose by לכפר.

But the usage of the phrase לריח ניחח in P casts doubt on the persistence of the original propitiatory force of it. The phrase occurs some fifteen times[1] in reference to the burnt-offering specifically, and some half-dozen times in reference to peace-

[1] Exod. $29^{18, 41}$, Lev. $1^{9, 13, 17}$, $8^{21, 28}$, $23^{18}$, Num. $28^{6, 8, 27}$, $29^{2, 8, 13, 36}$, cp. Jub. $7^{15}$.

offerings[1] and about as often in reference to meal-offerings.[2] In addition to these uses, we find the phrase half a dozen times in comprehensive references to burnt-offerings and peace-offerings and the meal-offerings and libations that accompanied them[3] or to these meal-offerings and libations specifically. Over against this *frequency* of assertion that burnt-offerings and peace-offerings produce a ריח ניחח stands the fact that only in a single instance does the phrase occur in reference to the sin-offering and never in reference to the guilt-offering. But even this single occurrence of the phrase in the ritual of the sin-offering is probably due to intrusion. The case stands thus: the ritual of the burnt-offering in Lev. 1 falls into three sections, dealing respectively with burnt-offerings of bullocks, small cattle, and birds, and in *each* section the phrase ריח ניחח occurs: similarly it appears in the first and second sections of the ritual of the meal-offering in Lev. $2^{2,9}$ (cp. v.$^{12}$), and in the first and third of the three sections of the ritual of the peace-offering in Lev. 3. The omission of the phrase in the third section of the meal-offering and the second of the peace-offering may have taken place in the course of transcription; but if the omissions already marked the original text they could, I think, be explained in one or two ways. On the other hand it is difficult to explain the single occurrence of the phrase and its threefold omission in the ritual of the sin-offering in Lev. 4 except on the hypothesis that the phrase in v.$^{31}$ is intrusive. The ritual of the sin-offering in Lev. 4 is divided into four sections; the first of these sections deals with the sin-offering required when the anointed, i.e. the high priest, commits a sin, the second with the sin-offering required of the whole congregation or community of Israel when it sins, the third with the sin-offering required of a ruler, and the fourth with the sin-offering required of an ordinary lay Israelite. In the fourth section only is it said that the parts of the sacrifice burnt upon the altar are intended to yield to God a sweet or placating odour. It is impossible to explain why the offering of an ordinary Israelite should, and that of a high priest, the whole community, or a ruler should not

[1] Exod. $29^{25}$, Lev. $3^{5,16}$, $17^{6}$ (Num. $18^{17}$).
[2] Lev. $2^{2,9,12}$, $6^{8}$ (E.V.$^{15}$), $6^{14}$ (E.V.$^{21}$), $23^{13}$.
[3] Num. $15^{3,7,10,13,14}$, cp. $28^{13,24}$, $29^{6}$.

yield a sweet odour; we are therefore driven to assume that if it was held to do so in the one case, it was also held to do so in the other; and that the omission of the clause in the three first sections is due to textual loss, or to the assumption on the part of the framer of the law that what was mentioned in the *last* section only would be regarded as applying to all sections equally; but neither of these assumptions is in the least degree probable: when, therefore, we observe further that the phrase which occurs in Lev. 1–3 in the set ritual of the burnt-offering, peace-offering, and meal-offering occurs elsewhere also in connexion with these offerings, but never in connexion with sin-offering or guilt-offering, the conclusion is in the highest degree probable that the law attributed to the burnt-offering, peace-offering, and meal-offering the power or purpose of producing a smell soothing or agreeable to Yahweh, but (though this may be the *expressed* view only of the later strata of P) that this sin-offering and guilt-offering had not this power or purpose.

Now if for the author of Lev. 4, containing the ritual of the sin-offering, the phrase לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ vividly retained its etymological meaning, if it still expressed a propitiatory purpose, it is remarkable that he should fail to use it; the effect of the omission is that those offerings which have least immediate, if any reference to sin, in which an expiatory purpose is least prominent if present at all, viz. the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, and meal-offerings, are represented by this phrase as aiming at propitiation, whereas the sin- and guilt-offerings, which spring, as the names suggest, immediately out of sin and the need for expiating it, are by the omission of the phrase not represented as propitiatory. On the other hand if the phrase already approximated in meaning or associations to the *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας* of the LXX all is clear and natural; the sweet smell of the sacrifice is not regarded as placating the anger of God at sin, but as a symbol of the pleasure of God in the due discharge of his service—a view which is represented by the paraphrase of the Targum which renders 'an offering which is received with pleasure before God'.[1] We may also cite

[1] Cp. Theod. *ὀσμὴ εὐαρεστήσεως.*

paraphrastically the fuller interpretation in Sifre (Simon b. Azzai, A.D. 100–130) on Num. $28^8$: 'ריח ניחוח is a phrase by which God signifies that there is נחת רוח[1], a rest of spirit, before him because he has given a command and his will has been done: so the expression is used when an ox is offered, so it is also when a head of small cattle or a bird is offered, in order to teach the lesson that he who offers much and he who offers little is alike before God, for God neither eats nor drinks (i.e. is not placated by receiving more rather than less): why then does he say, "Slay sacrifice unto me?" In order that his will may be done' (בשובל לעשות רצנו).

These late interpretations cannot of course prove the sense in which ריח ניחח was used even in the latest parts of the Old Testament, though they have their own interest as showing how later Jewish thought tended in places and at times to weaken the propitiatory element in sacrifice; but the rendering of the LXX carries back this tendency in Alexandria to the third century B.C.; and the distribution of the phrase in P possibly, as I have been suggesting, carries back the tendency in Palestine to the fourth century at least—the date of Lev. 4 ($P^s$)—if not another century to the date of the groundwork of P.

The present discussion has been preparatory to a more systematic examination of the place in Jewish sacrificial theory and practice of the ideas of expiation and propitiation. With these, so far as the earlier period is concerned, I hope to deal in the next lecture; with the later period, and especially with the ideas as displayed in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, in a lecture next term.

[1] When a man slays snakes on the Sabbath אין רוח חסידים נוחה הימנו, T. B. Schab. 121b; when a man bequeathes to strangers instead of to his sons אין רוח חכמים נוחה הימנו, Baba Bathra $8^5$, Abhoth $3^{10}$, כל שרוח הבריות נוחה הימנו רוח המקום נוחה הימנו. Cp. Aq., Symm., *ὀσμὴ ἀναπαύσεως*.

# VI

## SACRIFICE, PROPITIATION, AND EXPIATION

### iii

THE expiatory purpose of the later sacrificial system as set forth in P is indicated partly by the nomenclature of sacrifice, and partly by phrases that distinctly define the purpose of sacrifice. The sacrifices termed *ḥaṭṭaṯh*, which indicate by their name that they were the means of expiating or removing sin, are prominent in that system; the phrase לכפר, defining the expiatory purpose of sacrifice, proves that the nomenclature in this case was not merely traditional, but expressed a conception of sacrifice that was still vividly present; but this phrase is used not only in connexion with sin-offerings, but so widely that it is right, as we saw, to recognize that the later priestly sacrificial system had as a whole and in a certain measure an expiatory character, though this was intensified in connexion with certain parts of it. Another ancient phrase that occurs with frequency in the priestly ritual if it retained its original force expresses the propitiatory purpose of sacrifice; but we saw some reasons for concluding that the original force of this phrase was weakening in the earliest strata of P, and was perhaps used with a total loss of that force in the later strata.

I thus briefly resume certain conclusions reached in the two preceding lectures in order to point out the significance of usages in the later literature when we turn back as we do now to the theory and practice of sacrifice in early times. The terms sin-offering and guilt-offering, כפר to make expiation, ריח ניחח a soothing odour, were already current before the Exile, though their occurrence in the early literature is relatively rare. Still we could, if need were, in spite of this rarity of occurrence in the early literature, infer from these terms that expiation and propitiation were associated with sacrifice before as well as after

the Exile. But there is other evidence which brings this fact into clearer relief. My purpose in the present lecture is two-fold: (1) to survey the evidence for the association in pre-exilic thought and religion of expiation and propitiation with sacrifice; and (2) to attempt the more difficult but very necessary task of estimating the relative prominence of these ideas.

Nowhere perhaps is the propitiatory virtue in sacrifice more strikingly implied than in the well-known story of Saul's pursuit of David (1 Sam. $26^{19}$). Why, asks David, does Saul pursue him? He has given him no reason for doing so by any wrong that he has done the king. He cannot therefore stay the king's persecution by making reparation. He is innocent. Yet Saul obviously thinks he has something against David; and this thought of Saul's, argues David, may be due to the slanders of men; if so, let them be accursed! Or it may be due to Yahweh; for Yahweh is at times angry for reasons unknown to men; the fact that he is angry, however, becomes known to them by some trouble that befalls them, some inconvenience that they suffer; then the only thing to do, or the most natural and usual thing to do, is to bring a sacrificial offering, and to burn the victim or parts of it on the altar; then as the fumes arise Yahweh smells them, his anger is placated, and he withdraws from the man whom he has been troubling whatever he has been suffering. Such obviously enough is the line of thought or theory that lies behind David's words: 'If it be *Yahweh* that hath incited thee against me, let him smell an offering'. It matters little whether the words attributed to David were spoken by him, or were merely placed in his mouth by the popular story on which this early narrative rests. Their significance is this: that they are not a carefully stated theory, in which case they might represent the thought of an individual only; but that they allusively and unintentionally reveal a current mode of thought; and in this current popular thought the purpose of sacrifice was, by burning the flesh on the altar and causing the fumes to rise, to placate the anger of Yahweh. It was out of this mode of thought that the phrase considered in the last lecture arose; and at the same time and among the circles in which the story arose ריח ניחח obviously may or must have retained its original meaning, a 'soothing odour'.

Further, the story of Noah's sacrifice (Gen. $8^{20\,ff.}$) itself is a further illustration of this thought.

We may note two details in the story of Saul's pursuit of David before passing on. First, David distinctly implies that no sin is on his conscience, and there is no suggestion that he thinks of the possibility of sins of ignorance being the cause of Yahweh's anger. The sacrifice is therefore regarded here as simply propitiatory, and not also in the first place as expiatory. Second, the very general term מנחה is used for sacrifice: that general term which meant primarily a present or a gift, and could be used in early times so as to cover every form of sacrifice. The sacrifice probably implied is the burnt-offering.

We turn next to 2 Sam. 24. This chapter has been well described by Budde as 'before all else the *ἱερὸς λόγος* of the Temple at Jerusalem, the charter for the sacrificial service which was rendered to Yahweh on Mount Zion'. The character of the chapter thus lends a particular importance to the idea of sacrifice which underlies it. As the popular character of 1 Sam. 26 gives to the allusion which it contains to propitiatory sacrifice a value far beyond the reasoned theory of any individual, so this story of the origin of sacrifice on Zion, since it stands by itself, receives from that fact and its character the value of widely current thought or theory. It is a story that was often told and commonly believed. The story culminates in the first sacrifice on Mount Zion and, in order to this, the building of the altar which was to become the central and ultimately the only place where Israel might carry on its sacrificial service; but the same story *opens* with the record of Yahweh's anger against Israel. 'And the anger of Yahweh was hot against Israel'; and in his anger Yahweh acts exactly as in 1 Sam. $26^{19}$ David imagines he may be acting then; i.e. in his anger against one party Yahweh incites a third party against the first; in this instance, in his anger against Israel Yahweh incites David against them; David becomes the means, by numbering the people, of the pestilence that then ravages them; then he builds the altar, and offers sacrifices, and 'Yahweh suffered himself to be entreated for the land and the plague was stayed from Israel'.

The chapter has probably not escaped some modification at

the hands of editors or copyists; into this question it is not necessary to enter here; there can be no question that the sequence which still stands in the chapter stood in the original story, though there it perhaps stood out more clearly; and that sequence is this: the anger of Yahweh; the pestilence from Yahweh that slew its thousands throughout the length and breadth of the land and was threatening Jerusalem with destruction; the building of the altar on Mount Zion and the offering of sacrifices on it; the acceptance of these by Yahweh and the cessation of the pestilence. In other words, the holy story that described the origin of the sanctuary on Zion and of its ritual traced back that ritual to a sacrifice of propitiation. As the story of 1 Sam. $26^{19}$ calls the propitiatory sacrifice by the general term *minḥah*, present, so this story describes them by the comprehensive summarizing phrases burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. But this narrative, *in its present form* unlike 1 Sam. $26^{19}$, speaks of 'sin' (v.$^{10}$), though whether this particular point belongs to the original form of the story is open to doubt; and in any case the *expiatory* character of the sacrifice is not clearly indicated.

In another passage (1 Sam. $3^{14}$), however, it is the expiatory rather than the propitiatory purpose that stands out clearly; it is one of those early passages where כפר is used with the accusative of the sin committed; the sin of Eli's sons was beyond pardon; therefore have I sworn, is Yahweh's message to Eli through Samuel, therefore have I sworn to the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli's house shall never be expiated by means of sacrifice or offering.

Since the Book of Job is a post-exilic work, we cannot use the story of Job's sacrifices as evidence of pre-exilic theory without reserve, unless indeed we accept the theory that the prologue and epilogue are derived from a pre-exilic Folks-book. But since the story in the prologue and epilogue seeks to give the events recorded a setting in the patriarchal age, it is worth while to glance in passing at the reference to sacrifice. The prologue relates that Job offered *burnt*-offerings on the morning after his children had been feasting; for, said Job, it may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts. The expiatory purpose of his sacrifice of burnt-offerings is clear.

The propitiatory purpose of the sacrifice recorded in the epilogue is equally clear: 'Yahweh said to Eliphaz . . . My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends . . . now therefore take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering; for him will I accept that I deal not with you after your folly.'[1] The anger of God at sin may be placated by a burnt-offering; but, according to the epilogue of Job, whether true or not in this respect to ancient theory, not by a burnt-offering alone; the prayer of a righteous man on behalf of those who offer is needed to make the offering acceptable.

The costliest form of burnt-offering was that of a child; and the costliest instances of this type consisted of a first-born or only child. Curiously enough as it may seem superficially, not all offerings of this kind were propitiatory. But a clear example of a propitiatory offering of this kind is recorded in 2 Ki. $3^{27}$: When Israel had driven the King of Moab to his last fastness, and even there the king's position had become desperate: then the king took his eldest son that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering on the wall. And there came great wrath against Israel: and they departed from him and returned to their own land. The sacrifice in this case is a Moabite sacrifice, but the interpreter is a Hebrew interpreter. We need not necessarily infer that a Hebrew interpreter would have approved of a similar sacrifice to Yahweh under any circumstances, but as to the purpose and effect of approved sacrifices to Yahweh also he speaks if indirectly yet clearly enough. The general principle of sacrifice follows clearly from the theory of this particular sacrifice which is in no way obscure, and is this: Chemosh, the god of Moab, was angry with Moab, and in his anger had allowed her people to be reduced to the last extremities; at this point the King of Moab propitiates the anger of Chemosh by offering up to him his eldest son; the anger of Chemosh is by this sacrifice deflected from Moab and poured out on Israel, who in consequence retire in all haste from the sphere of Chemosh's influence.

The matter-of-factness and insouciance of this story would by itself indicate that the Hebrew narrator did not look upon

[1] [Job $42^{7}$ f.]

the incident as in any sense unique; he was familiar with human sacrifice and with the propitiatory aim of such sacrifice. There are also other stories in the O.T. that speak of human sacrifice, though not always attributing to it the same purpose, and excavation in Palestine has brought to light much evidence that points to a certain prevalence of human sacrifice, both prior to and subsequently to the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan. To examine and criticize this evidence would take more time than is at our disposal; it must suffice to say that one form of human sacrifice to which the archaeological evidence points is that of the foundation sacrifice; now the custom of sacrificing a human being, or later a surrogate, is associated often and possibly primarily with a propitiatory purpose. And for this reason the Canaanite foundation sacrifice may be combined with the Moabite sacrifice of the royal heir to Chemosh as affording evidence of the extent to which propitiation was prominent in the thought of Israel's neighbours. In itself this indeed proves nothing for Israel, for Israel at times, and in important respects, re-acted against its neighbours. But it is important enough when we find slight traces of similar custom or thought within Israel.

Of propitiatory human sacrifice in Israel we read mainly in the records of the seventh century. It was then that among the Jews the custom became frequent of offering children as burnt-offerings in the fires lighted in the valley of Gehinnom; it is commonly said that the victims were offered or passed over to Moloch, i.e. to the divine king, though Jeremiah ($19^6$) speaks of the people as 'burning their sons in the fire as burnt-offerings unto Baal'. Yet it is probable that the king or Baal who received these ghastly offerings was in the thought and intention of those who made them Yahweh; so much seems to follow from Jeremiah's repudiation: 'They have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I (i.e. Yahweh) commanded not, neither came it into my mind.' For Yahweh to say that he did not command the people to sacrifice their children to a rival god would have been superfluous; on the other hand, if the people thought that by sacrificing their children they were doing their best to placate Yahweh, it was very much to the point for the prophet to insist that such rites

had no place in the worship of Yahweh. That *his* human sacrifices had an expiatory and propitiatory aim is tolerably certain in any case, and clearly implied if Mi. 6 is rightly referred to the seventh century. For there the prophet introduces the people, asking 'Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my womb for the sin of my soul?'[1]

It is frequently inferred that this frequent recourse in the seventh century to child-sacrifice in the belief that it formed a powerful propitiatory was due to the circumstances of the time. It is not strange that the people should then, under the stimulus of foreign example, or through an extension of their own old native customs, substitute for the sheep and oxen, with which they had been accustomed to propitiate Yahweh in times of need, the costlier lives of their children. The one point of importance for our present discussion is just this: that the seventh century appears to have witnessed an emergence into greater prominence of propitiatory rites, though at the same time they attached themselves to and were but an intensification and multiplication of what had previously been a factor in Hebrew life.

I must not stay here to discuss the question as to whether these seventh-century offerings to Moloch should be regarded as a revival of an ancient custom of sacrificing the first-born to Yahweh, which in the interval had been replaced by the custom of the redemption of the first-born. The theory in itself appears to me improbable; but if it were sound, it would still remain uncertain whether that earlier custom was a propitiatory rite. To this question I shall have something to say later on.

I pass now to consider the relative importance of expiatory and propitiatory rites before the Exile.

And I remark first that in the main the narratives we have considered refer to *occasional* rather than to regular sacrifices. The anger of Yahweh had to be propitiated when it manifested itself in some calamity or striking misfortune, whether individual or national; but long periods, both in the lives of an individual and of the nation, passed away without any such manifestations, and consequently without need of propitiatory sacrifice. Towards the close of the eighth century and in the seventh century no doubt the occasions in the national fortunes for

[1] [Mi. 6⁷.]

propitiatory sacrifice appeared to the people at large to multiply: and such sacrifices took an increasingly prominent place in worship. But at the same time came the prophetic challenge to the whole theory that underlay them. The theory that sacrifice could placate Yahweh and regain his favour, or that it could expiate sin, even if it is not categorically denied by the prophets, is yet completely undermined by the whole tenour of their teaching. According to them propitiation and expiation alike are to be wrought by well-doing alone; what was past, was past, man could not undo it by sacrifice or in any other way: God might wipe out the record of it from his book, remove it far away or otherwise disregard it: but his anger at offences was to be changed into favourable regard by the resumption of well-doing—'Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgement in the gate: it may be that Yahweh . . . will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph'[1]: this, which is typical of the prophets, is very far indeed from 'If it be Yahweh that hath incited thee against me, let him smell an offering.' In view of the very slender remains of the prophetic teaching, it is always in such cases necessary to speak with caution; but there is no indication that men like Isaiah, Amos, Jeremiah, felt the need for any such transaction as some Christian theories of the Atonement demand before God could again become favourable to one who had sinned, but had turned from his sin and set himself to well-doing; we cannot safely infer, therefore, that generally speaking they demanded sacrifice as well as well-doing. I have suggested in an earlier lecture that we cannot safely conclude that all the prophets denounced sacrifice under all conditions; purged of its abuses they may have been ready enough to see the continuance of eucharistic sacrifice; it would have been much less compatible with their criticism of the popular religion to admit either the expiatory or the propitiatory validity of sacrifice; and though in Ezekiel we do find side by side the theory that the sinner who abandons his ways is saved by the rightness of his conduct which he exchanges for his former sin and the provision that the future cultus shall include expiatory offerings, we find no attempt to harmonize the two or to relate the theory of salvation by right conduct to the practice of expiatory sacrifice.

[1] [Am. $5^{15}$.]

This at least we may say: the tendency among the mass of the people in the eighth and seventh centuries to give greater prominence to expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices was accompanied by a prophetic tendency to eliminate expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice altogether from religion.

In dealing further with the relative importance of expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice in the earlier history of Israel, I bring forward three general considerations:

1. The character of the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* of the sacred places. I have already cited the story of the origin of the cultus in Jerusalem (2 Sam. 24). What I now observe is this: that story alone, among the fairly numerous *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* which have come down to us, traces back the cultus to a *propitiatory* sacrifice. In contrast to this stand certainly the stories of Shechem, Beersheba, Bethel, and probably those also of Ophrah, Mizpah, and Hebron. Thus the altar at Shechem was traced back to Abraham, who built it on the occasion of Yahweh's appearing to him and promising the land of Canaan to his posterity (Gen. $12^{6f.}$); the altar at Beersheba, according to the story in Gen. $26^{23 ff.}$, was erected on the occasion of a similar theophany and promise to Isaac, and beside it Isaac made a feast—a sacrifice at first doubtless—to Abimelech when just afterwards they made a covenant with one another. The altar and cultus at Bethel claimed Jacob as their founder, and the occasion of their founding in Jacob's gratitude to God for having brought him safely and in prosperity back to his native land (Gen. 28, $35^{6f.}$). And even though other O.T. narratives refer more briefly and with less detail to, or hint less clearly at, the nature of the *ἱερὸς λόγος* at other sanctuaries, we may safely infer from Judges 6 that the sanctuary at Ophrah, from Gen. $31^{54}$ that that at Mizpah, and from Gen. $13^{18}$ that that at Hebron, all traced back their cultus to eucharistic sacrifice.[1]

2. The second consideration which I submit is also in part based on a *ἱερὸς λόγος*, but this is of such a special character that it calls for separate examination. And the point now is the significance of the fact that the two most conspicuous stories of human sacrifice contemplated or performed by Hebrews,

[1] Of course not all sacrifices at these sanctuaries were eucharistic any more than all sacrifice at Jerusalem was propitiatory.

represent even these costly sacrifices not as propitiatory, but as eucharistic.

The twenty-second chapter of Genesis, the story of Yahweh's trial of Abraham by demanding of him the sacrifice of Isaac, seems to be, or to be based upon, the ἱερὸς λόγος of some sanctuary where, according to tradition, at one time human sacrifice was offered, but for which later the sacrifice of rams was substituted. It is not of importance for our present purpose to determine what this sanctuary was, whether that of Jerusalem, as was commonly held, or Shechem as others have thought, or Jeruel—a place near Tekoa—as Gunkel[1] has argued. Nor again is it necessary to determine in detail what may be the historical nucleus or the exact nature of the myth or legend underlying the story. As the story now stands it is a study in human character and God's demands. It is in a certain measure an early parallel to the Book of Job: in both cases Yahweh, by the trial of character, brings out the genuineness of the religion and devotion of the man who is tried. In Job's case the vindication of character is achieved through loss and suffering that actually befall him: in Abraham's at the last moment the loss and suffering that threatened are turned aside: yet only when it has become clear that Abraham no less than Job could have said: 'Yahweh hath given and Yahweh hath taken away: blessed be the name of Yahweh.' And there is one difference: unlike Job, Abraham in the story never imagines for a moment that Yahweh has become alienated from him. No room can be found in the story for a propitiatory sacrifice.

In order to see the true significance for our present purpose of the characteristics of the story which I have just singled out, it is necessary to recall the Phoenician myth that has so often been compared with it. The Phoenician story as recorded by Sanchuniathon[2] runs that 'Kronos going about the world gave to his daughter Athena the kingdom of Attica. But on the occasion of a pestilence and mortality, Kronos offered up his only begotten son to Ouranos'; and then more fully: 'It was customary with the ancients in times of great calamity in lieu of (i.e. to prevent) the destruction of all for the rulers of the city

[1] *Genesis*, pp. 212 f.

[2] Eus. *Praep. Ev.* i. 9.

or nation to sacrifice to the avenging daimons their most beloved child as a λύτρον: and those who were given for this purpose were sacrificed with mystic rites. Kronos, now, whom the Phoenicians call Ἔρ and who after his death was deified in the star known as Kronos, when he was king, had by a nymph of the country called Anobret an only son who is on that account called Ἰεούχ, for so is an only son still called among the Phoenicians: and when great danger from war beset the land, he adorned the altar, and invested his son with the emblems of royalty, and sacrificed him.'

The object of sacrifice in this Phoenician story is obviously propitiatory; in this respect it resembles the story of the sacrifice of the King of Moab's eldest son, and not the story of Abraham and Isaac.

What was the object or purpose of sacrifice in the cultus of the place referred to in Gen. 22? If we infer from the nature of the story in Genesis, that children were to be offered there with the same absence of propitiatory intent as we observe in the Abraham of the story, then we must infer directly the antiquity at this particular place of sacrifice that was not propitiatory. But if either on the ground that the story of Abraham and Isaac and the Phoenician story must have a common origin, or on other grounds, we infer (and this is the more probable inference) that sacrifice at this place was predominantly propitiatory, an equal or greater significance for our present inquiry attaches to the incident. For then we observe in the transformation from a story such as survives in Phoenician of human sacrifices intended to propitiate the anger of the gods into the story of Genesis where the completest harmony exists between God and Abraham, where God is wholly pleased with Abraham and Abraham wholly devoted to God, where God asks and Abraham is ready to sacrifice his son as a mark of this utter devotion, then we observe, I say, the great plastic power of the theory that sacrifice is pre-eminently the gift of men to a God who has deserved their gratitude and receives their devotion.

In the story of Jephthah the human sacrifice is actually offered; but here also quite clearly not because Jephthah wished thereby to appease the anger of Yahweh, or to expiate some sin; on the other hand the occasion of the sacrifice was a

victory, the sentiment that inspired it gratitude; and though the father quails when he perceives the real cost of the indefinite vow which he has made, the victim herself boldly and proudly accepts her fate, 'forasmuch as Yahweh hath taken vengeance for thee of thine enemies'. The significance of this story also is enhanced by the fact that it is associated with an annual rite.

3. I have pointed out now the absence of the propitiatory and the presence of a eucharistic purpose in the majority of the legends describing the foundation of famous sanctuaries and also in two striking stories of human sacrifice and the transformation of possibly propitiatory theories into eucharistic ritual. It remains to refer summarily and even allusively, for this is all that time will permit, to the predominance elsewhere of the eucharistic purpose, or to the festal character of sacrifice.

Of the commonly festal character of sacrifice we have much evidence in several vivid scenes in the early narratives such as the picture of the sacrifice on which Samuel is bent when Saul and his servant come in search of their asses to Ramah (1 Sam. 9). Such scenes, which are for the most part pleasingly depicted in the narrative, readily became at times scenes of excess: and to this aspect of them the prophets mainly allude. Thus it was natural for Eli to assume that Hannah might be drunk with wine on the occasion of sacrifice[1]; and it was the tables, presumably, at which the sacrificial meal was being eaten that Isaiah depicts as defiled through the filthy excess of those who were eating it.[2] Alike the innocent mirth of the more pleasing scenes and the excess of the darker pictures strongly reflect a conception of sacrifice in which men eat before a kindly and favourable deity, not before one who needed placating. And this prevailing, though not exclusive, character of sacrifice has left its mark on the phraseology of Deuteronomy, where to rejoice before Yahweh and to eat before Yahweh are alike synonyms for to perform and to take part in the sacrificial cultus.

Not only were sacrificial occasions pre-eminently happy occasions, but in theory at least, and we may believe at least at times in practice also, occasions for dwelling on the goodness of Yahweh and professing gratitude to him. The liturgy

[1] [1 Sam. $1^{14}$.] [2] [Is. $28^{7}$ ff.]

preserved in Dt. 26 is surely no mere imagination of the seventh-century author of the book: but, like so many of the laws of the book, rests on actual practice. This liturgy is that of the presentation of first-fruits: in it the goodness of Yahweh is acknowledged in having brought his people into the goodly land of promise; and the security of the present which has allowed the harvest to be reaped is gratefully contrasted with the fugitive life of Jacob till he became the recipient of Yahweh's favour. Much in this liturgy may be earlier than Deuteronomy: on the other hand part of it has an obvious upward limit of date. The historic ground of gratitude is not primitive, though it is in the abstract possible that it runs back to the early days of Israel's settlement in Canaan. But is there any sufficient reason to doubt that the association with this cultus of the sentiment of gratitude is primitive or at least as ancient as the agricultural life to which it belongs? The wide prevalence of thanksgiving in connexion with offerings of first-fruits is certain. Among the many instances collected by Frazer I will cite but one: 'Among the hill tribes near Rajamahall, in India, when the *kosarane* grain is being reaped in November . . . a festival is held as a thanksgiving before the new grain is eaten. On a day appointed by the chief a goat is sacrificed by two men to a god called Chitariah Gossaih, after which the chief himself sacrifices a fowl. Then the vassals return to their fields, offer thanksgiving, make an oblation to Kull Gossaih, and then return to their homes to eat of the new *kosarane*'. (*Golden Bough*, ii. 467).[1]

It is true that over against many instances of eucharistia Frazer cites one instance of possibly a propitiatory offering of first-fruits (op. cit. ii. 324)[2]: and that his own theory is that the most primitive treatment was the *eating* of first-fruits, and that the eucharistic *presentation* of them represents a second stage in the development (op. cit. ii. 459).[3] But when we combine the wide prevalence of eucharistic first-fruit presentations, the liturgy of Dt. 26, and the large place in Hebrew sacrificial rites of feasting and mirth, we may somewhat safely conclude that the eucharistic character was ancient in Israel, though the exact grounds of gratitude may have varied in different ages.

[1] [Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, xi. 118.]
[2] [Ibid., 82 ff.] [3] [Ibid., 111–13.]

The eucharistic nature of the three great festivals and occasions is clearly indicated in Dt. $16^{16f.}$. 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before Yahweh . . . every one shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of Yahweh thy God which he hath given thee.' And again Deuteronomy is true not only to its own age but probably also to earlier times: the similar command in the earlier Book of the Covenant[1] to appear thrice in the year before Yahweh less distinctly expresses yet sufficiently hints at a eucharistic rather than a propitiatory purpose, and the obviously eucharistic nature of the offerings which Hosea (2 and 4) indeed regarded as made to the Baalim but the people themselves intended for Yahweh point in the same direction: and Hosea significantly enough uses 'mirth' as a comprehensive anticipative apposition to festival (חג), new moon and sabbaths and all her appointed seasons, viz. of sacrifice (Hos. $2^{13}$ (E.V.$^{11}$)).

The regularly recurring sacrifices—those of the great festivals, of the new moon and sabbaths were occasions of mirth, and the religious sentiment that accompanied them was gratitude: the expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices with their naturally more sombre sentiment were occasional.

There are differences, unimportant differences, to be discovered between the earlier and later Jewish religious practice and theory. But they are differences of emphasis and frequency in the different periods rather than of entire absence of some of them. Sin-offerings after the Exile formed a prominent part of the great recurring sacrificial seasons; this they probably did not do before the Exile, though as *occasional* sacrifices they were even then offered. And to sum up my discussion of the earlier period: The *character* no less than the *number* of the references to sacrifice of different types and with different objects indicates that while propitiation and expiation as the end of sacrifice were in the earlier periods of the history of Israel anything but unknown or even exceptional, it was also far from being constant or even relatively frequent. Sacrifice was more often eucharistic than propitiatory, and it was more often offered with feelings of joy and security than in fear or contrition.

[1] Ex. $23^{14}$.

# VII

## ALTARS: LITERARY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

In previous lectures I have dealt mainly with the materials and occasions of sacrifice, the difference of custom which they underwent, and the relation of custom and modification of custom to belief or theory. There still remain for consideration the altar and the ministrants of sacrifice, and more immediately the altar. Like the material and occasions of sacrifice, the altar underwent modifications; but variety in the altar, and modification of practice in respect to it, belong more largely to the earlier periods, and attracted less interest and provoked less theory at a later period. For example, Philo, who contributes many observations, and Josephus a few, in regard to the meaning of the material and occasion of sacrifice, have but little to say on the meaning of special features of the altar. Our present inquiry, therefore, takes us more largely into the origins and early history of Jewish, or rather Hebrew, sacrificial custom and belief.

The term 'altar' would at first appear to be sufficiently precise; yet as a matter of fact no little discussion affecting some fundamental questions of sacrificial custom and its meaning has arisen as to the scope of the term, as to what is and what is not an altar; to take a single instance, the question has arisen whether the *massebah*, the 'pillar' of E.V., was originally itself an altar, not, as it appears in Hebrew literature, simply an appurtenance of an altar. It is fruitless in such a case starting out with a definition, but it is important to define and justify the range of inquiry. In one respect the term 'altar', in relation to English description of Hebrew usage, is much less confusing than the term 'sacrifice'; the term 'sacrifice' in E.V. corresponds to several Hebrew terms, and is the consistent rendering of none; on the other hand, 'altar' always corresponds to מזבח, Aram. מדבח, except

in Ex. $38^{7}$ (A.V.: R.V. it = altar), 2 Ch. $30^{14}$ (altars (R.V. Mg. 'vessels') of incense = המקטרות) and Is. $65^{3}$, where it corresponds to nothing in MT and is omitted in R.V., and thrice in Ezek. $43^{15, 16}$; in these three cases 'altar' (A.V.), and the compound expressions 'upper altar', or 'altar hearth' (R.V.) render the Hebrew ארא(י)ל, and in N.T. 'altar' regularly renders *θυσιαστήριον*, once only (Acts $17^{23}$) corresponding to *βωμός*. If then we could define the Hebrew term מזבח to our satisfaction, we should also be defining the term 'altar' as used in almost every instance in the E.V. of the O.T. Etymologically the Hebrew term is perfectly clear, but its very clearness, unless we are on our guard, may become misleading; the term means 'the place of slaughter', but, even though we limit this as the place of slaughter of sacrificial victims, the etymological meaning is too narrow to cover the uses of the term; in usage the altar became the place where sacred victims were *burnt* rather than where they were slain, and even the place where inanimate offerings, that never could have been *slain*, were burnt. No doubt the etymological meaning casts an important light on *an* origin of sacrifice; but regard for this fact must not limit our inquiry in such a way as to exclude from consideration other factors intimately and essentially connected, that may cast light on *other* origins of sacrifice and persisting elements in the Hebrew ritual of sacrifice and sacred gifts. In addition to and in connexion with what the Hebrews called 'the altar' (מזבח), it will be necessary to consider the piece of sacred furniture termed by them 'the table', with or without some closer definition. On certain conceptions of sacrifice this table may, indeed, be in no sense an altar; but this really carries us back to a question of origin which has come before us previously, viz. as to whether animal victims were, if not the exclusive, yet in all cases the prior and proper material of sacrifice. Yet at a certain period or at certain periods with the Hebrews, at least, the terms 'altar' and 'table' become intimately associated if not in some degree interchangeable; the term 'altar', as already remarked, is not limited to what was used for animal victims; and it is by some supposed that even the altar used for animal victims was in certain connexions termed 'table'. Even though the last point is far from certain, it still remains necessary to consider sacred

table and altar together in relation to sacrifice. And it may be convenient at once to examine the use of the term 'table'.

Much the most frequent use of the term 'table' for a sacred object is in reference to the table of the Shewbread, or rather the table of Presence (שלחן הפנים), on which the sacred loaves, renewed weekly, were arranged. The table prepared for Gad, referred to in Is. $65^{11}$, may have been an object more or less similarly used in the cult of a foreign deity. Of tables used for sacred food nothing further need be said at present, except to refer to the mode of reference to the table of Shewbread in Ezek. $41^{21\,f.}$; if the Hebrew text (cp. E.V.) were correct, either the table of Shewbread is referred to as 'the altar', or the altar of burnt-offering is termed 'the table that is before Yahweh', and in either case we should have an identification of the terms 'table' and 'altar', and of the interchangeability, in Ezekiel's thought at least, of the ideas covered by the terms. But from what is probably the true text (LXX) not so much follows: this reads, 'And before the מקדש was an appearance like the appearance of an altar of wood', i.e. an altar-*like* piece of furniture; this refers to the table of Shewbread standing before the Holy (of Holies), but it is not, if this text is right, actually said to be an altar, but to have looked like an altar; in other words, there is with Ezekiel an association but not an identification of the ideas of sacred table and altar. On the other hand, the identification exists in 1 Ki. $6^{20,\,22}$, where, in spite of much textual corruption, מזבח seems clearly used of the table of Shewbread or ? = golden altar of incense (ארז corrupt).

It is commonly said, however, that the altar of burnt-offering is termed 'the table of Yahweh'; the passages cited in proof, apart from the passage just discussed, which, as just stated, probably does *not*[1] refer to the altar of burnt-offering, are Ezek. $44^{16}$, Mal. $1^{7,\,12}$. Of these, Ezek. $44^{16}$ has been differently interpreted; Davidson e. g. says of the table, 'the altar of burnt-offering is no doubt meant', and Driver in his note on Mal. $1^{7}$ cites this as one of the passages in which the altar of burnt-offering is called a table; but on the other hand, Bertholet understands the 'table' of Ezek. $44^{16}$ to be that of the Shewbread,

[1] 1 Ki. $7^{48}$ in spite of Dr. on Mal. $1^{7}$, Kit. *Studien*, p. 102, n. 4.

and this seems the more probable. Certain writers bring to this passage as proof that Ezekiel *could* call the altar of burnt-offering a table his words already cited in $41^{22}$ (so Da., Dr.); we might rather surmise from the true text of that passage that what he might rather have said was that the altar was *as* or *like* a table. For a decision we are driven back mainly to the context, which, though perhaps not conclusive, seems to balance against the conclusion that Ezekiel in this place calls the altar a table. The passage reads: $44^{15}$ 'But the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charges of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister to me, and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the bread, saith the Lord God: [16] they shall enter into my sanctuary (מקדשי), and they shall come near to my table, to minister to me, and they shall keep my charge. [17] And it shall come to pass, that when they enter in at the gates of the inner court, they shall be clothed with linen garments, &c.' The question is: Is Ezekiel here defining *two* privileges, or merely, twice over, a single privilege of the priests as distinguished from the Levites? Does he mean the priests shall (1) offer fat and blood on the altar of burnt-offering outside; and (2) shall approach the table of Shewbread inside the holy building? or does he only mean that they shall approach the altar outside the *Temple* but within the *sacred enclosure*, and on it offer the blood and the fat? As a matter of fact the non-priestly Levites slew the victims for the altar (Ezek. $44^{11}$), and presumably, therefore, as they brought them, *approached* the *altar* though they never ascended it like the priests to offer the blood and the fat, but they never *entered* the Temple so as even to *approach* the table of Shewbread. A mere repetition of what is said distinctly in terms that exclude the Levites in v.[15] in terms that are not obviously unsuitable to them in v.[16] does not seem probable; and even though it could be proved (which it cannot) that Ezekiel elsewhere called the altar of burnt-offering a table, it would still seem improbable that he is doing so here.

Before considering the two passages in Malachi, it will be convenient to look at another passage in Ezekiel where the term 'table' seems to be used in the derivative sense of food set on

a table, table-fare. The passage ($39^{19-20}$) is figurative and eschatological; God destines the hosts of Gog to become the victims and to be eaten at a great sacrificial feast; and to those summoned to the feast God says: 'Ye shall eat fat till ye be full, and drink blood till ye be drunken. . . . Yea, על ישלחני ye shall have your fill, &c.' Should "על יש be rendered (E.V., Toy): 'at my table', as though the meaning were 'sitting at or round my table'? In that case this would be (another) case of the altar of burnt-offering being termed 'table'. But another view of the idiom is possible and has often been adopted (e. g. *BDB*, s.v. על, 1 e); on this view the preposition has the same force as in 'Man shall not live by (על) bread alone' (Dt. $8^{3}$), and 'table' the same meaning as τράπεζα in 1 Cor. $10^{21}$: 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.' The table of Yahweh in this case is not the altar, nor exactly the flesh placed on the altar of burnt-offering, but the food sanctified by the burning of other parts of the victim on the altar. It is the fare set by Yahweh for his guests.

The second meaning just proposed for Ezek. $44^{16}$ really seems most obvious in Mal. $1^{7}$, though 'table' is commonly said to mean there the altar itself. The passage reads: 'And ye say (viz. to Yahweh), Wherein have we treated thy name with contempt (בזינו)? (In that) ye offer upon my altar polluted food (לחם): And ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee (or LXX it)? In that ye say, Yahweh's table is contemptible. And is it not a bad thing when ye offer (viz. to Yahweh) a blind animal for sacrifice? And is it not a bad thing when ye offer a lame animal or one that is sickly? Try making a present of it (viz. such meat) to the governor (of) thy (province)? Is he going to be pleased with thee or take thy part (for such a miserable present as that)?'[1] Here the contemptible table of Yahweh seems to correspond more closely to the phrase 'polluted bread' than to Yahweh's altar; it is the flesh set before Yahweh or eaten for him by his priests rather than the altar on which the flesh was set. Even in v.$^{12}$ of the same chapter the polluted table corresponds antithetically rather to the pure offering of v.$^{11}$ than to the altar.

It seems to me wisest then, not to press any of these passages

[1] [Mal. $1^{6b-8}$.]

as direct proof that the altar of burnt-offering was actually termed 'the table of Yahweh', but they are, even so, striking proof of the close association of the ideas of 'altar', the structure at or on which offerings made to Yahweh were slain and, in whole or part, burnt, and of the 'table' on which food for Yahweh, i.e. in the mind of Ezekiel and Malachi the priests, or food hallowed by Yahweh for the use of his worshippers, was arranged. There is no doubt difference as well as similarity of idea, once two distinct and definite objects, altar of burnt-offering and table of Shewbread, came to exist side by side, just as, when the terms derived from Jewish practice were transferred to Christian practice, some difference of dominant idea or theory attached to the Eucharist according as that on which the elements were arranged was called 'table', as it was predominantly in the first three centuries, or 'altar', as it was more frequently later. But the *origins* neither of 'altar' nor of 'table' can be conveniently discussed in isolation.

In regard to the altar, as to other features in Hebrew sacrificial custom, we have good reason for expecting two distinct lines of influence, which we may term extra-Canaanite or intra-Canaanite, according as they derive from the custom of the desert and the steppes, the home of the Hebrews before their incursion into Canaan, or from the customs of the agricultural life of Canaan. On the *origin* of the altar and the table there was, according to P, no such double influence; both alike were the result of direct divine instruction given at Sinai; but even if that record were historical there would be room for the double influence referred to in the subsequent history of the altar; and this of course has been generally recognized. Even though such an altar as P describes was, in every period, alone legitimate, in the actual usage of the community there was variety. In respect both to numbers and materials there are certain obvious stages. We have a period of many altars, a period of one altar of burnt-offering, and after A. D. 70, a period of no altar; similarly a period of altars constructed of stone or of earth, a period of bronze, and finally, if we may so put it paradoxically, a period of the immaterial altar, when in the absence of a material altar the altar idea is projected into the spiritual realm under the guise of a heavenly altar.

K 590

In all the stages just referred to the altar is a structure; but there are narratives in the O.T. itself which have been understood as referring to what may be termed natural altars—rock-surfaces, artificially modified perhaps, but not structures.

So far a brief *résumé* of the literary evidence, but some structures, still more rock-surfaces endure; and explorers and excavators have reasonably enough sought for altars. To what extent has their search been successful? Are the objects which they have identified as altars clearly and recognizably such? and consequently how far does archaeology in this matter reinforce literary evidence as to custom and belief?

We have on the one hand in the O.T. various terms for or used of rock-surfaces or sacred stone objects; and on the other hand various classes of stone structures, preserved intact or, if broken down or fractured, not destroyed beyond recognition of their function, and brought to light by exploration or excavation. How do these stand related to one another? To what extent do the terms refer to altars? To what extent do ancient altars recognizably survive?

The Hebrew terms in question, some of them technical, some of them wide terms used only in certain connexions of sacred rock or stone, are מצבה, R.V. pillar; מזבח, altar; צור, rock; גל, R.V. heap; גלגל, in R.V. always treated as a proper name, Gilgal, with neglect of the article which is invariably used except in the narrative of the naming of the place in Jos. $5^9$ (in M.T. in Jos. $12^{23}$ also לגלגל); אבן גדולה. The archaeological types are in the terminology now widely used of stone monuments in other countries as well as Palestine: (1) Menhirs, single upright stones; (2) Dolmens, which in their simplest form consist of two uprights supporting a third placed roof-wise; (3) Cromlechs, circles or other groups of stones forming an enclosure; (4) Alignments, groups of stones in lines; (5) Rock-surfaces naturally or artificially remarkable more especially owing to the presence of cup-marks. These cup-marks are at times associated with stones of the first four groups, which, however, unlike a mere rock-surface, are distinguishable without the presence of such marks.

The correspondence of Menhir to Maṣṣebah is obvious and generally recognized. As already remarked, on a certain theory

of sacrifice the Maṣṣebah has been regarded as a primitive or germinal form of the altar; but of an altar on which an animal victim was neither slain nor burnt, but to which unguents or liquids could be applied as by Jacob to the Maṣṣebah at Bethel.[1] We need not pursue this point further here, except to remark that the Menhirs would admit of anointing but not of receiving the animal or its carcase for slaying or burning. In this case we are able to identify the Hebrew *technical* term for an archaeological type. For the last archaeological type mentioned above, the rock-surface distinguished by special features, we can certainly discover no technical Hebrew term; but there are passages where the wide term צור 'rock' appears to refer to such rock-surfaces and to their use as altars. To these we shall return in the next lecture. The stones of which the Cromlechs or Alignments consist are of the Menhir-Maṣṣebah type; and there is merely one point to detain us for a moment here. It is possible that the Hebrew technical term for a Cromlech or stone circle survives in *gilgal*, though on another theory[2] the term really meant not the *round* or circle, viz. of sacred stones, but collectively the *rolled* (stones), in which case it may have referred to groups or collections of stones without reference to the form of the single cairns and Alignments as well as to Cromlechs. That one of the places named Gilgal possessed, at all events, a *group* of stones—whether arranged in a circle, line, or how, we are not informed—we learn from Jos. 4. According to this story twelve stones stood in the Gilgal, and they had been erected there in commemoration of the passage of the Jordan. But there can be little question that what the chapter actually contains is a story that had grown up amongst the Hebrews to explain a prehistoric monument which had stood and given its name[3] to Gilgal long before the Hebrews entered the country. In the narrative these stones are called by the common name אבנים, 'stones', and it is perhaps implied that they were of no

[1] Gen. $28^{18}$.

[2] Baudissin in *ZDMG* lviii, 410 correcting 'Malsteine' in *PRE* xii. $131^{28}$f:.

[3] How such names of places and towns arose we can perhaps actually see in Gen. 28: in or near the ancient town of Luz stood a numen-inhabited stone—a Bethel; people spoke of going to Luz or to the (famous) Bethel (of the place): gradually Bethel became the common term even for the town and drove out the old name. Cp. Kit. *Studien*, 117.

very striking size: the story thinks of them as borne each on a single man's shoulder. Possibly the narrative in its present form both deliberately omits the use of the technical term מצבה for these stones, and also suggests a harmless explanation of that term for those who, reading the story, knew that the stones were commonly called מצבות: the stones, according to the story, were taken out of the Jordan, ממצב רגלי הכהנים, 'from *the place where stood* the priests.' From the fact that Gilgal and Geliloth seem to be interchangeable names or descriptions, Baudissin (*ZDMG* lviii. 411) suggests that the individual stones composing the Gilgal were called not only מצבה but גלילה, and גלילה he connects with גלל, subsequently incorrectly pointed גִּלֻּל (=εἴδωλα in Pent.), a favourite term with Ezekiel for idols; the גלל, he argues, is primarily a great stone, a numen-inhabited stone. Whatever the size or terms applied to the stones—whatever the shape of the group, it is certain that a group of stones stood at this particular Gilgal near the Jordan and Jericho: a second point about this place is also certain: it was a place, and indeed a famous place, of sacrifice. This is shown clearly enough by the narratives in Samuel of the anointing of Saul[1] and of Saul's and Samuel's sacrifices there[2]; the sacrificial importance of this Gilgal is still further attested, if it is identical with the place so named mentioned frequently in Amos and Hosea[3]; if it is not identical then this Gilgal of the prophets is a second Gilgal of sacrificial fame. The sacred nature of these places was, no doubt, originally marked by, and continued to be associated with, the ancient stone monuments from which they derived their name: and it is further probable enough that the place of sacrifice continued, throughout the historic period, to be either within the circle or in the immediate neighbourhood of the Gilgal proper. But if the Gilgal was a circle of many stones, not all the stones were actual altars, possibly none of the stones of the circle was such: but the altar may have lain within or adjacent to the circle. With this the use of the preposition ב in speaking of sacrifice in Gilgal agrees; the distinctive preposition על, used for sacrificing *on* the altar (Ex. $20^{24}$, Gen. $22^{9}$, Dt. $12^{5-7}$), is never used of the Gilgal: it is true that

[1] [1 Sam. $11^{14\,f.}$.] [2] [1 Sam. $11^{15}$, $13^{8-10}$, $15^{33}$ (?).]
[3] [e. g. Am. $4^{4}$, $5^{5}$, Hos. $4^{15}$, $9^{15}$, $12^{12}$ (E.V.$^{11}$).]

ב is also used, though much more rarely, even of the altar (Gen. $8^{20}$, Num. $23^{2, 4, 14, 30}$), so that בגלגל *might* possibly mean *on* the Gilgal; it no doubt does mean, however, in the area—whether the stone-circle itself or the town named after it—which contained the altar; just as it was common to speak of sacrificing *in* (ב) such and such a town, *in* the mountain (Gen. $31^{54}$: *cf. on* the tops of the mountains), and even *in* the *bamoth*, or high places which contained but were not themselves altars.

There are further facts worth considering in relation to the probability that an altar when associated with a group of stones was independent of the stones themselves. The story (Ex. $24^{4}$) that Moses (at Sinai) built an altar under the mount and twelve Masseboth, according to the number of the twelve tribes of Israel, points to familiarity with altars adjacent to but distinct from a *group* of Masseboth. If we adopt Baudissin's suggestion with regard to the meaning of the term Geliloth, and take that term in the sense he suggests in Jos. $22^{10 ff.}$, we have a similar scene depicted: 'And when they came to the Geliloth of the Jordan . . . the children of Reuben, &c. built there an altar. . . . And the children of Israel heard saying, Behold the children of Reuben, &c. have built the altar beside (על) the Geliloth of Jordan.'

The surviving stone monuments of Palestine, which have by some been largely identified with ancient altars, are dolmens; this theory of Palestinian dolmens is, perhaps, losing ground, but cannot be said to be dead. Strongly advocated by Conder in earlier publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund, it has recently been attacked, not to say ridiculed, by Dr. Duncan Mackenzie in his report of an examination, undertaken by him, fresh from experience of European dolmens, of certain megalithic structures in the neighbourhood of Amman.[1] But so distinguished and erudite a scholar as Baudissin accepts the dolmen[2] as being, at least in certain cases, an altar, and Spoer in an article in *ZAW*, 1908, proposes a theory of the evolution of the altar of which the starting-point was the identification of altars with dolmens. The question still requires examination.

No Hebrew term for dolmen, if such ever existed, survives, and it is very doubtful whether any of the numerous narratives

[1] *Pal. Annual*, i (1911).

[2] *PRE* xii. $133^{22 ff.}$ So also Kit. *Studien*, p. 124, n. 1; Kennedy, *DB Altar*.

of the O.T. referring to stone structures refer to dolmens in particular. There are one or two interesting possibilities: that is all. Spoer (p. 275 f.) has indeed claimed that the narrative in Gen. 31 not only has in view a dolmen-altar, but contained the Hebrew technical term for such, viz. גל. 'The primitive one-stone altar', he remarks, 'was enlarged by the addition of other stones, as the narrative of the covenant between Laban and Jacob shows, Gen. $31^{46, 48, 51 f.}$. The גל is the altar which was erected on the occasion of this solemn covenant, and beside[1] which the sacrificial feast was eaten. In the גל may be seen the equivalent of the dolmen, which was the simple one-stone altar transformed by the addition of others into an altar-*structure*.' Not only is there nothing in the narrative to indicate that the *gal* was of dolmenic form: but there are positive suggestions to the contrary, and in favour of the commonly accepted view that what Laban and Jacob erected was a *heap* or *cairn* of *many* stones, not a structure, like a dolmen, consisting of a definite small number—three, four, five, or six. The etymological meaning—apparently *rolled together*—need not be pressed; but the use of the term of the stones with which the corpse of Achan (Jos. $7^{26}$) and the King of Ai ($8^{29}$) were covered, and of the mass or heap into which the masonry or materials of overthrown buildings sink (Is. $25^{2}$ al.: note Hos. $12^{12}$, E.V.$^{11}$), point to a collection of many stones. Moreover, the narrative itself suggests the collection of many smallish stones, rather than half a dozen of great stones at most, for the construction of the גל; the verb used here is לקט; and Jacob said to his brethren, 'Gather (לקטו)[2] stones, and they took (יקחו: gathered LXX) stones and made a *gal*.'

It is possible, though there are other possibilities, that the fabled bedstead of the great King of Bashan, Og, at Amman,[3] the material of which was iron (ברזל), i.e. the black basalt or iron-stone of the country, and the measurements of which were *c.* 13 feet by $6\frac{1}{2}$, was a dolmen[4] rather than, as is more commonly

[1] על. Spoer with R.V. may be right in taking the prep. in this sense: possible also is *on* the *gal*.

[2] Used elsewhere of gathering flowers (Cant. $6^{2}$), manna, arrows (1 Sam. $20^{38}$), sticks (Jer. $7^{18}$), and particularly of gleaning corn.

[3] [Dt. $3^{11}$.]

[4] Cp. Conder, *Heth and Moab*, 155, 245; Gressmann, *Z.A.W.* 1909, 115 n. 2.

assumed, a sarcophagus. If so, ancient folk-lore did not regard this particular dolmen as an altar.

On the other hand, we should have an instance of folk-lore recognizing in some dolmens altar structures if we were to accept Vincent's suggestion that the groups of Moabite dolmens suggested the story of Balaam's offering sacrifice on the group of seven altars made for him by Balak.[1]

But all this is at best uncertain; there is no unmistakable reference to dolmens in the O.T. In considering whether these structures or any of them are ancient altars we must turn from the literary to the archaeological evidence.

Dolmens have been observed in great numbers on the east of Jordan, but on the west exceedingly few have been found. Kitchener in *PEFQuSt*, 1878, p. 168, reported a total of eight on the west—four of them, according to Conder (*Heth and Moab*, 242 ff., Vincent, p. 411 f., cp. *PEF*, 1901, p. 409), in upper, one in lower Galilee, and three near Tell El-Ḳady. For long it was supposed that these monuments were entirely lacking in Judah, though Tyrwhitt-Drake had already reported traces of one in the very centre of Judah (*PEF*, 1874, 187), and Oliphant another in 1885 (ib., p. 181)—a fact commonly attributed to the reforming zeal of Josiah. But more recently the number discovered has been gradually increased; and among the more recent discoveries are dolmens in Judah—in 1900 (*PEF*, 222) Macalister reported one at Beit Jibrin, and the next year (*PEF*, 1901, 231) another near Tell Sandeḥannah; and in 1901 Père Janssen described one found near Bethany (*RB*, 1901, 279). But these with a few others within and beyond Judah leave the number in Western Palestine still very small.

In East Palestine the total number discovered is very large; dolmens have been found there by the hundreds, and often in large groups within a restricted area. I cite a few reports to illustrate these two points—numbers and grouping—together with some others important for our present discussion.

Of the dolmen-field at 'Ain-Dakkar in the Jaulan, some fifteen miles east of the north-eastern shores of the Sea of Galilee,

[1] *Canaan d'après l'Exploration Récente*, p. 424; Num. $22^{41}$, $23^{1, 14, 29}$.

Schumacher writes (*Across Jordan*, 62 ff.): 'Half a mile north-east of 'Ain-Dakkar . . . a marsh . . . surrounds a stony region of about 30 acres, which is completely covered with dolmens. 200 yards north of this again a second field extends for about a mile west, over a slightly elevated ground, down to the Jisr er-Rukkad, and covers an area of 120 acres . . . the whole country round is extremely stony, and quite unfit for cultivation, being covered with small volcanic mounds, from which are taken the large stone slabs used in the construction of dolmens.' A particular specimen Schumacher describes as built on a double terrace of basalt stones, 'which has a total height of 3 feet 2 inches; on this is erected a row of upright slabs 3 feet to 4 feet 7 inches high, and 1 foot to 1 foot 8 inches thick. These surround a covered chamber from 7 to 13 feet long, with an average width at its western extremity of 4 feet 6 inches, at its eastern of 3 feet 3 inches. The main axis of the building runs east and west. A single slab closes the eastern, another the western end, and generally two suffice for the long sides. On the top a great block of basalt—of an irregular square—7 to 8 feet or even more in either direction, and from 1 to 2 feet thick, covers the dolmen, having at the corners of the western end two raised headings. Should the chamber exceed 8 feet in length, two slabs of irregular length laid close together serve to cover it in'. 'The dolmens generally lie about 10 yards apart'; standing on one Schumacher counted 160, and computed the total number in this district at not less than two or three times this number. 'An examination of many specimens', Schumacher remarks, 'makes it apparent (1) that the dolmens of this district are always built on circular terraces, which elevate them about 3 feet above the ground; (2) that in most cases they are formed by six upright and two covering-slabs; (3) that the major axis of the dolmen runs east and west; (4) that the western side of the dolmen is broader than the eastern; (5) that the western side is often distinguished by headings, one on each corner of the top slab; and (6) that they vary in size from 7 to 13 feet in length'. Mr. Guy le Strange, visiting this dolmen-field subsequently, found one or two dolmens having a small opening about 2 feet in diameter (sufficient to crawl through) pierced in the eastern end slab.

To some six miles south of 'Ain Dakkar dolmens occur in numbers, and, far less frequently, to about the same distance north. The greater number of the volcanic mounds round Jamleh and Kurbit Hamatah on the southern confines of this district are crowned by a fallen dolmen. Near Hamatah the dolmen, instead of being raised on a terrace, is surrounded by a rectangular fence of stones about 3 feet high and about 2 feet 6 inches from the side of the dolmen.

Near the village of Tsil, and from 3 to 5 miles down (SE.) the Roman road that skirts the dolmen-field of 'Ain Dakkar, Schumacher (pp. 149ff.) discovered another great field of dolmens. This stretches for about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles and has an average breadth of 200 yards and an area of about 120 acres. Here lines of rude unhewn stones about 1 yard high run in straight rows among the dolmens, and 'at the western end of the dolmen-field is a mound Rujm el-Kheleif covered with rude blocks of basalt. Each dolmen here occupies an elevation, but whether this was artificially terraced or not cannot now be determined'. The side stones are smaller in size and larger in number—four to six on each of the long sides—than at 'Ain Dakkar; an upper slab covers the western part of the chamber, but no example has been found in which it lies at the East; but many of the dolmens are in ruins and their upper slabs fallen.

Single dolmen slabs can be traced all the way from 'Ain Dakkar to the dolmens of Tsil.

At Tell el Muntar, some four miles only east of the Sea of Galilee, Oliphant (in Schumacher, 259) observed a dolmen-field containing about twenty dolmens averaging perhaps 100 yards apart.

In Ajlun,[1] the northern part of the country east of Jordan between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, Schumacher examined a field of about 1,000 dolmens; and numerous groups have been observed in Moab, Conder in the *Scenery of Eastern Palestine* reporting in 1881 150 at El-Maslubiyeh (p. 250) and as many more at El-Mareighat (p. 255) or some 700 in all in Moab (*Heth and Moab*, p. 198). Among these southern specimens the simple trilithon is more conspicuous; and Musil

[1] *Ajlun*, 131–4, 169–77 (Vincent, p. 411 n.).

(*Arabia Petraea*, i. 269) gives an illustration of a portion of the northern slope of Gebel el Maslubiyeh showing eight trilithons arranged in two rough lines (3 and 5) following the slope of the hill; another such line he depicts on the southern slope of the Wadi el 'Afrit.

A not infrequent feature of the East Palestinian dolmens is that they have a floor-stone covering the ground between the uprights; and in these floor-stones,[1] not less than on the covering-stones,[2] cup-marks have been observed. It is also reported that cup-marks, which are anything but a regular feature of the covering-stones, have been found in some cases not on the upper but on the under side. A further point with regard to the covering-slabs is that they do not always present a flat surface; at times, owing to the uneven size of the supporting stones, they are far from horizontal, and have a marked, in some cases a very pronounced tilt[3]; in other cases the upper surface of the covering-stone is not flat; Merrill (p. 324) reports of one at 'Ain Dakkar that the covering-stone was a cone-shaped block.[4]

The modern Bedawin have different theories with regard to these stone structures; they are *Munahir*, watch-towers,[5] or Beit el Ghûl, Ghuls' houses or graves, more than one group, including that at 'Ain Dakkar, going by the name of Qubur Bene Israil, graves of the children of Israel.

The theories of modern scholars have also been various: Merrill (p. 439) seems inclined to suspect them of being Roman sentry-posts! But for the most part theorists have considered two competing theories: (1) that the dolmens are altars, (2) that they are graves or sepulchral ornaments.

The first of these theories seems to be at least insufficient; i.e. it does not offer a reasonable explanation of *all* or even most of the dolmens. For (1) the existence within the limited area of 800 acres or so of hundreds, in one case of a thousand, *altars* is extremely improbable, *except only we intend by altars, places for the reception of offerings to the dead*; (2) the

[1] *Heth and Moab*, 258.
[2] Also on other blocks: Vincent, 417 n. 1.
[3] See fig. 2, *PEF Annual* 1.
[4] Cp. p. 111 below.
[5] See *Heth and Moab* 325.

obvious *chamber*-character of whole groups of dolmens indicates that in these at least the covering-stones are primarily *roofs*, not tables or altar-tops; (3) the tilt of the covering-stones in many instances, and the uneven upper surface in other cases, equally indicates that the primary function is to roof, not to secure a surface for slaughter, burning, or presentation of offerings.

The altar-theory of dolmens can at most be partial; and this in two forms; though many and even the great majority of dolmens cannot have been constructed for the purpose of serving as altars, it is conceivable either (1) that *some* were so constructed, or (2) that some acquired a secondary function as altars.

If all, and not merely most, dolmens were enclosed and, wholly or partly, roofed chambers, there would seem to be no room left for a theory of dolmens having had as their primary function to serve as altars. But the trilithon which occurs particularly in Moab does not suggest chamber structure, and is only to be explained as such if good ground be shown for assuming that all dolmens served the same purpose, and that the more elaborate chamber dolmen developed from the trilithon for the more effective discharge of the original purpose. The shape of the trilithon suggests an altar or table,[1] though not unambiguously, for taking the mere superficial suggestion of shape it might suggest the arch.

If, then, we isolate, with Conder,[2] the Moabite or in particular the trilithon dolmen, how far can objections to the altar theory in this limited form be pressed? There remains the objection arising from the large numbers within a restricted area. Moab does not indeed contain the largest dolmen-fields, but two groups of about 150 have already been referred to. The shape and tilt[3] of some of the covering-stones also remains as an objection. On the question of numbers, Conder (*Heth and Moab*, 234) is merely able to point to the fact that Balaam is said to have sacrificed at seven altars at three different sites, and to allege

[1] So even Gressmann, *ZAW*, 1909, 113.

[2] *Heth and Moab*, 232.

[3] See picture of Heshbon dolmen, *Heth and Moab*, 190.

without, not to say against, evidence that 'New altars were built apparently whenever an important sacrifice was to be offered, and sacred centres would thus in time become crowded with such structures "like heaps in the furrows of the field",' suggesting that these last words were used by Hosea with dolmens in his mind's eye.

Of positive evidence apart from the ambiguous evidence of shape that might suggest that the dolmen of the trilithon shape was used, if not constructed, as an altar, by far the most important and interesting is the modern custom of the Beloha Arabs. 'The Arab', Conder reports of them, 'surrounds the grave of a man of noted sanctity with a circle of stones, and places on one side (almost invariably on the west) a little dolmen about three feet high, consisting of two stones supporting a third laid flat on the top. Whenever he visits the spot he kisses this stone and invokes the dead man's aid, placing his forehead on the altar, and then depositing a gift—a stick, a bullet, a copper coin, a berry, a piece of blue pottery, or some other material of his visit. He faces east as he does so, and mutters a prayer' (*Heth and Moab*, 327 f.).[1]

On this there are two points to be observed: (1) ancient dolmens are in some cases surrounded by a stone fence, but do not form an adjunct to any such enclosure which might be regarded as tomb or temple; (2) the modern trilithon altar is a receptacle for offerings to the dead—as Conder himself puts it elsewhere.

Into other theories of dolmens it is unnecessary to enter here, and impossible adequately to discuss them, for this would involve an examination of evidence of similar stone monuments in other countries as well. This only need be said: The sepulchral character of many dolmens—alike in Palestine and elsewhere—is now generally accepted, and there is perhaps an interesting tendency to regard this as sufficient explanation of all. And we may say of the Palestinian dolmens that whereas many are, or

[1] Cp. Musil, p. 268, whose language, however, leaves it very obscure what exactly is the proceeding (*Vorgang*) of the modern Bedawin at the graves of their ancestors, and cp. Vincent, 416, Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 268 'plays the role of a threshold': cp. p. 270 on Sheikh Muflet with pictures on p. 271.

all perhaps may be sepulchral, many are not, and possibly none are primarily altars. At the same time many of these dolmens present features, especially cup-marks, which suggest that offerings were made on or within dolmens. The significance of these for the evolution of the Hebrew altar may be left to the next lecture.

# VIII

## THE ALTAR: EARLIER HISTORY

THE earliest law of the altar (Ex. $20^{24-26}$) contemplates a more or less permanent *structure* of soil (אדמה), or of rude, unworked stones. The altar is to be *made*, wherever Yahweh manifests his presence; but once made it is to be maintained and repeatedly used afterwards: for where Yahweh has once manifested his presence, there will he make a practice of doing so in the future: and when he appears, there he wills to receive the offerings made to him.

This *permanency* of the altar may well have been the intention in all periods of its history; but certain narratives of the O.T. suggest that not in all cases was the altar a *structure*; and it is probable that constructed altars were preceded by altars obtained by the simple selection of existing natural rock surfaces; though it is possible enough that the unconstructed altar—in part owing to the force of the principle of permanency—continued in use after the custom of constructing altars of earth or stone had arisen.

There are thus narratives, in the O.T. in particular, which appear to refer to such unconstructed rock or stone altars, though in none of them is the term 'altar' unambiguously applied to the rock surface or stone; on the other hand, two of them close with a record that an altar was first constructed *on* or *in lieu of* the previously used rock surface or stone; the third either does implicitly term the rock surface an altar, or implies that an altar, distinct from the rock surface, stood on or near it. The narratives in question are those of Gideon (Jud. 6), Manoah (Jud. 13), and Saul (1 Sam. 14). The first two of these refer to fixed rock surfaces, the third to a single movable large stone. In the third the *slaughter* of the animal seems to be an essential sacrificial act, and the stone is, though not so termed, in the most literal sense of the Hebrew term, a place of slaughter מזבח—an

altar. On the other hand, in the story of Gideon the slaughter takes place at some distance from the rock; and in this case the essential sacrificial act, according to the older custom contemplated in the story (for it is a story of transition and has an older and later custom in view), is the presentation of food. In the story of Manoah the essential act is, as in the later and more familiar Jewish ritual, the burning of the victim in fire.

Associated with natural rock surfaces, or movable rocks, in either case with something unconstructed, we have three types of sacrifice, or of sacrificial acts—slaughter, presentation of food, burning. How is this form of altar, or adjunct of altar, how is the evolution of the altar related to the practice of sacrifice, and changing conceptions of God reflected in the mode of sacrifice or the relative importance attached to different acts performed at the altar? The first stage in any resolution of these questions must concern itself more fully with the narratives to which I have briefly referred, and with certain distinctively marked rock surfaces brought to light by exploration and discovery; for here again the literary and archaeological data illuminate one another.

According to stories current as early as the ninth or eighth centuries, the constructed altar used in the worship of Yahweh at Ophrah, a township of Manasseh, not far from Shechem, but of which the site has not been identified, was regarded as the work of Gideon; on this point both the stories (Jud. $6^{11-21, 25-32}$) preserved in Judges agree: but in details they differ. According to the one, belonging probably to the later literary source, this altar of Yahweh was built by Gideon after he had pulled down a previously existing altar which had been built for and used in the service of Baal. This story thinks of Ophrah as an ancient place of cult, where from time immemorial an altar, built in the customary manner, had stood; down to the days of Gideon men offered sacrifice on such an altar to Baal; Gideon, as a zealous devotee of Yahweh, destroys Baal's altar, the previous use of which defiled it for use in Yahweh's service, and built a new altar for Yahweh. The story preserves the memory of an ancient change in the cultus at Ophrah: but how accurately? Was a *constructed* altar so unusual a feature as the story implies? Or was a constructed altar prior to that now used

in the service of Yahweh merely a popular inference from the altar customs prevalent in the age when *this* story took shape? By that time it was, as Ex. 20 shows, the law of the altar that it should be *built*; and it was only natural for the story-teller, in explaining how one altar was discontinued and another brought into use, to think of that earlier altar in terms of the present and to describe the discontinuance of its use in terms of demolition of a structure.

The parallel story concludes with the statement that Gideon built an altar to Yahweh which was still standing at the time, more or less remote from Gideon's day, in Ophrah. It does not directly assert that an altar stood there originally, or that Baal there received offerings from his worshippers. On the other hand, it tells vividly and with much suggestive detail how, on the spot on which Gideon subsequently built an altar, the angel or messenger of Yahweh, in the guise of a traveller, one day rested under the oak or holy tree in Ophrah, or rather apparently just outside the village, and addressed Gideon, who was working hard by. Gideon begs to be allowed to serve the traveller with a meal, and, receiving permission, goes away—presumably to his house in the village—slays a kid and prepares part of it as broth, part as meat, and makes unleavened bread. He brings the broth, the meat, and the cakes with him; the visitor, instead of eating what is set before him, draws fire from the stone on which it was set, which burns up the meat and the bread; according to a verse which some regard as secondary, the broth was, at the visitor's direction, poured out on the rock. Gideon realizes by the way in which the meal he had prepared is treated that his visitor is not human but divine, and, in accordance with the custom embodied in the law of Exodus, builds an altar.

There are features in the story as we now read it which suggest that it has been more or less modified: certain phrases suggest that from the first the visitor reveals his divine character, and even that Gideon at least suspected it, and went away to prepare, not a meal for a fellow man, but a sacrifice for a divine visitor. According to different methods of dealing with these features, two views have been taken with regard to Gideon's intention in preparing the food: one is that he intended simply to prepare food for a human traveller, the other

that he so prepared it that it was sacrificially correct, with a view to testing, by the manner in which his visitor disposes of the food,[1] whether he was human or divine. In the latter case certainly, but possibly also in the former, we best explain this story, in the light of the later parallel, as resting on a remembrance, or possibly a surviving second use, of a different altar custom; in the days of the story-teller, sacrifices were offered on a constructed altar in Ophrah; but it had not always been so: and the story-teller knows that once—if not also still by some—sacrifices were offered on the bare rock or stone beside the holy tree; there the worshipper poured out on the rock broth to God, and there for God's use he left the meat and the sacrificial cakes. What in particular happened to the broth we may surmise in the light of archaeological data; but what ought we to infer was the *ancient* use with regard to the meat and the bread? Were they burnt on the rock, burnt like the flesh of animal victims and like the meal offering in later Hebrew ritual? Or were they simply deposited and left there? Is the action of the angel according to previously existing custom with regard to sacrificial food? Does he reveal his divine character by abstaining from partaking of the food as a human visitor would have done, and compelling it instead to be treated as food offered to God? Or does he by his action give a practical demonstration of what the usage must *henceforward* be, revealing his divine character and consequent right to instruct by the miraculous treatment of the flesh and bread? Does the story recall the institution at Ophrah not only of a constructed altar in lieu of a natural rock, but also of a practice of burning the food offered instead of simply leaving it, after the manner of the usage of the table of shewbread, before Yahweh?

Some of these questions may be for the present, perhaps must be altogether, left unanswered. But we conclude with considerable probability that the earliest story of changes in the sacrificial custom at Ophrah recorded not the substitution of one object of worship for another, Yahweh for Baal, nor the substitution of one altar for another *of the same kind*, but the disuse of a purely natural for a constructed altar, with doubtless

[1] Kittel: [*Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie*,] p. 98 f.

some change in the precise character of the ritual. Ultimately, no doubt, the later story is substantially correct: the immemorial custom of sacrifice on the bare rock ran back to Canaanite usage; if in Ophrah Canaanites lived side by side with Hebrews the two uses may for a time have continued together, Canaanites still offering their broth, their flesh, and their meat on the natural rock after the Hebrews had taken to burning their offerings on the altar of earth or stone. Whether slaughter from the first took place beside the built altar we cannot say; from the fact that the story does not refer to the matter, and the angel does not in this respect require any change of practice, we may perhaps infer that it did not.

In the story of Manoah (Jud. 13) the theophany takes place in the open country (בשרה, v. 9) outside the village of Ṣor'ah (v. 2), but obviously not far from it (cp. vv. 9, 10, 11, 15, 19). In this case the angel appears in human guise, and addresses Manoah's wife as a 'man of God' (v. 6) come to impart to her special knowledge. On the first occasion Manoah's wife is alone, and finds out nothing further about her visitor. On the next occasion she is at first alone again, but at once runs home for her husband, who, when he comes and engages the angel in conversation, at first suspects nothing of the visitor's divine nature (v. 11). The conversation on the child to be born being ended, and Manoah being now sure of the angel's instructions, presses him to stay to dinner, promising him for it a kid. There is no suggestion here that Manoah has at present in mind a sacrificial offering. On the other hand, the angel in this story at once declines the invitation to dine, and suggests that Manoah may make a sacrificial offering to Yahweh: 'I will not eat of thy food: but if you would prepare a burnt-offering (עלה) for Yahweh, you may.' Manoah accepts the hint. Presumably, as Gideon in the other story, though here the detail is not explicitly stated, Manoah goes home, while the angel stays on the spot where he had appeared; having reached his house, he selects (ויקח, v. 19, cp. Gen. 18[7]) a kid, and, whether before or after slaying it is not stated, returns and offers it on the rock (ויעל על הצור ליי). Thereupon, as the flame leapt up from the altar, the angel ascended with it, and Manoah knew that he had seen God. The points of present importance here are two: the

sudden introduction of the rock (הצור) as the place of offering, and the sudden substitution of altar for rock in the next verse. In any event the rock appears as something well known in connexion with sacrifice at Ṣor'ah to the writer and his readers; but are we to infer that the natural rock was the altar (Moore, p. 323), or that a constructed altar stood on or beside the rock (Kittel)? The former certainly seems the more obvious meaning, for the phrase ויעל על הצור ליי corresponds, with the simple substitution of צור for מזבח, exactly to the common expression העלה (העולה) על המזבח (ליי); but the analogy of the expression ויעלהו עלה על החמה in 2 Ki. 3[27] of the sacrifice of the king of Moab's son might perhaps be claimed as justifying the view that the story in Judges contemplates an altar on the rock: for we may, perhaps, suppose that the King of Moab utilized an existing or constructed an altar on the city wall in order to burn his son.

So much for the narratives of sacrifice on slabs of natural rock *in situ*. In 1 Sam. 14 we have a narrative of a great movable stone used for the nonce to legitimize the slaughter of animals captured, slain, and eaten after a battle, and of this stone being subsequently built, along with other stones, as we may presume, into an altar. The narrative reads, adopting one or two emendations: 'And the people dashed on the spoil, and took small cattle, and oxen and calves, and slaughtered them earthwards (ארצה): and the people ate (them) blood and all; And Saul was told, The people are sinning against Yahweh in eating blood and all; and he said "to those that told him", Roll "hither" to me a great stone. And Saul said, Disperse among the people and say to them, Bring hither unto me each of you his ox or his small cattle, and slaughter them (here) and then eat: that (so) you may not sin against Yahweh in eating blood and all. And all the people brought each what was in his hand "to the (stone that was) rolled" and slaughtered (them) there. And Saul built an altar to Yahweh; with it[1] he began to build an altar to Yahweh.'

There are one or two other narratives that connect sacrifice with great stones, probably movable, though not, as in 1 Sam. 14, certainly said to have been moved. The ark, on its return from the Philistines, found its way to Bethshemesh; there it stayed, the

[1] H. P. Smith [*Samuel, ICC*, p. 117].

cart that carried it on a spot where was a great stone (so MT), or, as LXX has it, definitely implying that the stone was movable, when the ark reached Bethshemesh a great stone was placed beside it. Both texts agree in what follows: and they split up the wood of the cart, and the kine they offered up as a burnt-offering to Yahweh. The question which this passage raises, but leaves but obscurely answered, is: was the burnt-offering offered *on* the stone or on an extemporized altar, not mentioned in the narrative, beside it? Was this stone, as it stood, or was placed, used as an altar *of burnt-offering* (H. P. Smith at 1 Sam. 14), or as a *maṣṣebah*?

With this we may compare the story of the sacrifices for Adonijah's coronation feast: of these it is said that Adonijah sacrificed (ויזבח) sheep and oxen and fatlings by (עם) the stone of the dragon, which is beside En-Rogel (1 Ki. 1[9]). Here there is certainly no placing of victims *on* the stone; the preposition does not admit this: moreover, the kind of sacrifice contemplated is not in the last instance the burnt-offering, i.e. that form of offering where the entire victim was withdrawn from human consumption; but, as in 1 Sam. 14, the peace-offering. It is, however, not impossible that the ritual in 1 Ki. 1 and in 1 Sam. 14 was much the same: the victim may have been so slain that the blood gushed forth on to and over the stone.

Meanwhile, it will be useful to recall one other narrative of a 'great stone' that was actually moved, though in this case no sacrificial act is mentioned. In Jos. 24[25 ff.] it is said: 'Joshua made a covenant with the people . . . and took a great stone and set it up there under the sacred tree that was in the sanctuary of Yahweh. And Joshua said unto all the people, This stone shall be a witness against us, for it hath heard all the words of Yahweh which he hath spoken with us, and it shall be a witness against you lest ye deceive your God.' The stone being in a sanctuary (at Shechem) was doubtless close to an altar, unless it could be regarded as the altar itself: but of this the narrative gives no hint, and we could only hold that it may at one time have been such on the ground that such 'great stones' regularly were: but this, at present at all events, is far from made out.

I proceed now to consider the archaeological data that seem

to be related to the various narratives just reviewed. Ophrah, the scene of Gideon's altar, is an unidentified site; but Ṣor'ah, the home of Manoah, is clearly enough the modern Ṣur'a, fifteen miles west from Jerusalem. Now at about a quarter or half[1] a mile[2] from Ṣur'a there stands a rock rising some five or six feet from the present level of the ground, and with a base some 10 × 10 feet (cp. scale in Kittel, *op. cit.* p. 105) and a flat summit of about 5 × 5 feet, about 10 inches above the ledge or platform surrounding it, and in the side of the rock steps are hewn; and most of the flat surface of the top is marked by hollows connected with one another by channels. There can be little question that we have here a natural rock,[3] adapted in ancient times to use as an altar; and it may, though of course this point cannot be pressed, be the actual rock of the narrative in Judges. At Marmita, a short distance from Ṣur'a, another similar rock has been observed with an upper surface about 8 × 2 feet and even more plentifully marked than the rock at Ṣur'a with cup hollows and channels.[4] But far more famous than either of these among specially marked rocks rising above the present level of the soil is the great outcrop of rock now covered by the Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem. This great rock measures about 58 × 44 feet and rises 6½ feet above the pavement that now surrounds it (Baedeker); on its surface are various hollows and channels, and underneath a great cavern.[5] It is probable, though of this later, that on this rock the altar of burnt-offering in front of the Temple was subsequently erected.

Granted that these artificially marked or cut rocks were altars, it would be impossible from those just mentioned, rocks rising above the soil, to define the age of their use as altars; we could not pass beyond vague suggestions of antiquity. But excavation has brought to light other examples of which the antiquity

[1] *PEF*, 1887, 57. [2] Hanauer in *PEF*, 1885, 183 (with pictures).

[3] According to Schick 'the altar stands in the open field, but near a rocky ridge out of which it and the surrounding area have been hewn' (ib. 87, 58). According to Hanauer it is 'a huge limestone boulder' which 'does not appear to have been connected with the surrounding rocky ridge when hewn into altar shape' (ib.). [4] [See illustration in Kittel; op. cit. p. 120.]

[5] Subterranean chambers also at Gezer, Megiddo, Marmita. Cp. Kittel, op. cit. 108 n.

can be much more closely defined. Cup-marked surfaces have thus been shown to be of extreme antiquity;[1] but not all surfaces so marked were used as altars: many non-religious uses can be suggested for these marks, and doubtless explain many examples that occur; and even where, as in the 'High Place' at Gezer, the cup-marks occur on a clearly sacred site, it is not always certain that they were immediately connected with the altar in particular. We may, therefore, for the present, pass from mere cup-marked surfaces, even from such as are perhaps significantly associated with subterranean caves or hollows.[2]

But at Ta'anach Sellin[3] laid bare an artificially dressed surface, recalling the rock of Ṣur'a in its cup-marked upper surface, in its presentation of a wall-like appearance from a lower surface, and in its approach by a step. The upper face is something over 3 feet above a rock floor; it contains one great hollow or cup-mark, about 19 × 17 inches in diameter, and three smaller ones less than a quarter of the size of the larger.

The most striking utilization of rock *in situ* for the purpose of an altar[4] lies beyond the borders of Palestine, at Petra in Edom. But in considering the significance of this in relation to the history of the altar in Palestine, an important natural difference of the two countries must be considered. At Petra the vast extent of rock-cliff and surface offers itself for treatment in this way far more than the land of Palestine, which is in many places, it is true, rocky and stony, but always offers the opportunity of constructing an altar of gathered stones or turves as a very simple alternative to the selection of a suitable rock surface. The rock-hewn altar of Petra corresponds to the rock-hewn theatre, temple façades, and other monuments that form so striking a feature of the place—natural to it, unnatural or impossible in most other places. In being hewn out of the rock, not brought together for the purpose, the altar at Petra resembles the ancient rock-cut surfaces revealed by excavation, but in its elaboration it corresponds not to these, but to the elaborate constructed altars of later times. It belongs to the later rather than to the earlier history of the altar.

[1] Megiddo, Dr. [*Modern Research as illustrating the Bible*], 67.
[2] *Memoirs of Gezer*, ii. 378.
[3] Tell Ta'annek, *WAW Phil. Hist.* ii. 2, 1904, p. 31.
[4] *PEF*, 1900, 350 ff.

So far we have been concerned with the survival of altars of the type implied in the narratives of Jud. 6 and 13. This type is natural rock more or less dressed, but unquarried and left in position. The story of 1 Sam. 14 refers to the use of a stone or boulder rolled into position; obviously *such* extemporized altars, though they survive unchanged save by the weathering of 3,000 years, cannot be identified. But this narrative is illuminated by ancient Hebrew and modern Palestinian customs. Of ancient Arabian sacrifices Wellhausen remarks: 'The genuine Arabian rite of sacrifice (Opfer) is of remarkable simplicity. The blood is simply rubbed or poured on the holy stone' (*RAH*, p. 116). Nilus (sixth century A.D.), in an often quoted passage, speaks of stones in the plural gathered together: 'They offer to the morning star the best of the booty where anything fit for slaughter is found among it; and most willingly beautiful boys on stones gathered together, at dawn.' These 'gathered stones' correspond more to the improvised altar contemplated in the *law* of Ex. 20; the single stone to the massebah of Samuel. Modern observers of Palestinian custom, especially to the east of Jordan, are agreed that, as with the ancient Arabs, the essential sacrificial act consists in securing by the cutting of the throat, the head being turned in the sacred direction, the due emission of the blood of the victim.[1] In these cases a single stone is often used, the blood being caused to flow over it and into the hollow often worked in the stone; so, e. g., Schumacher (in Curtiss, p. 235 n.) records as a ceremony frequently observed by him among the Bedawin: 'A sheep or a goat is brought: the Kâtib or priest lays it across the altar, the body on the stone with head and neck falling over the side. He then cuts its neck with a knife, uttering the words *bismillah arrahman arrahim*.' These single stones are often hollowed out on the top and show circular cup marks.[2] According to the priest at Nabi Elisha the victim is slain on the rock, and the basin-shaped hollows in it serve for the reception of the blood. (Kit. 127 from Curtiss.)

Now when the altar as in the last case is reduced to, or, as we should perhaps rather put it, has not passed beyond, a single stone, it obviously approximates very closely in form at least

[1] Curtiss, p. 215. [2] Other instances in Curtiss, op. cit. 231 ff.

to another adjunct of the ancient Canaanite and the ancient Hebrew place of sacrifice, viz. to the *maṣṣebah* or standing stone. What is the relation between the primitive altar and the primitive maṣṣebah? Were they ultimately identical? Is it legitimate to speak of the maṣṣebah as an altar? or as 'sacred stone and altar' in one? In this connexion the maṣṣebah of Gen. 28 naturally presents itself for comparison with that of 1 Sam. 14. The stone which in the evening Jacob converts into a pillow he in the morning converts afresh into a maṣṣebah, and thereupon pours oil over the head of it. The last action no doubt is closely related to the pouring of blood over the stone implied in 1 Sam. 14; and in both cases the stone utilized is a stone of the locality moved into position—in Genesis, before being anointed, into an *erect* position; in Samuel, as it would seem, left *prone*; for in Genesis the stone laid lengthwise for use as a pillow during the night is said to be made into a maṣṣebah, an erect stone, before being anointed, but in Samuel we are simply told that the stone was 'rolled' into position: a stone of somewhat different shape is naturally suggested by the two narratives, that in Samuel being rounded and squarer and, however placed, probably with less that could be described as a 'head' than that in Genesis. On this general question it must suffice to remark here (1) that the narratives at least stand at different removes from the original significance of the action described; in Genesis it is still possible to detect the belief that God was in the stone, that *the stone* was a house of God,[1] and that anointing it with the oil brought the oil into direct contact with God; in Samuel, on the other hand, there is no suggestion of the indwelling of God in the stone, the action performed is an action to avoid the indiscriminate treatment of the blood: the blood must *pro forma* be poured upon a stone—a stone more or less selected at haphazard and that had not, as the stone in Genesis, previously shown its quality or given any indication of the special presence in it of deity; (2) the stone of 1 Sam. 14, therefore, is a stone of slaughter for the reception of the blood according to the will of the deity, but not, even in any form of the narrative which might be surmised as being

[1] The narrative concludes, 'And this stone which I have made into a *maṣṣebah* shall be (for me, LXX) the house of God' [28[22]].

behind the present, for direct application to him; the stone is an altar, implying by that for the moment something distinct from the deity, though, in virtue of its relation to his service, a sacred stone; it is not like the maṣṣebah of Gen. 28, sacred as being the actual residence of the deity. Thus whether we regard altar and idol or maṣṣebah as originally identical, the maṣṣebah in Samuel already represents the stage at which altar and deity or symbol of deity are distinct. Yet the double aspect of sacred stones—home of the deity, instrument in his service—may perhaps account for the rarity among the Hebrews of the use of the single stone altar, and for the form of the early Hebrew law.

Thus early Hebrew narrative, illuminated by modern discovery and excavation, and early Hebrew law together bring before us, in all, four types of altar in use in Canaan in the early centuries of the Hebrew settlement: (1) Single movable stones, (2) fixed rock surfaces, (3) structures of earth or turves, (4) structures of stones. The use of the second of these is *perhaps* not ascribed to Hebrews; there is, as we have seen, a certain ambiguity in the narratives involved; and in any case the narratives in question point to the substitution by Hebrews of built altars for the natural rock previously used, if not by themselves yet by the Canaanites, as an altar: of the use of the first type—the single movable stone—we have only one clear case; but this was used at the instance of King Saul; the incident is early; so also are the possible other examples of such use by Adonijah and at Bethshemesh; but Kittel is surely not justified in suggesting that its use by Saul was a case of reversion to early custom *under pressure of necessity*, or, as he puts it, for lack of a correct altar (p. 116): it would certainly have been possible and easy on the field of Michmash to have found turves or stones and with them rapidly to have constructed such an altar as the law contemplates. We may rather conclude from the narrative that Saul insisted not on an altogether novel or exceptional device, but what was in that age the correct procedure under the circumstances. We may with some safety conclude that among the Hebrews built altars, whether of earth or stone, survived the use of single stones and rock surfaces. Did they also precede it? is the use by the Hebrews of single

slaughter stones and rock surfaces for the deposition of offerings merely an interlude due to their settlement in Canaan? If we confine ourselves to the history of *Hebrew* custom, we cannot answer this question merely by tabulating a chronological table of types of altars for ethnography in general. Barton, e.g., in his article on Altar (Semitic) in *ERE*, claims that the altar built of undressed stones or turf is more primitive than worked rock surfaces found and left *in situ*; because human hands have fashioned the rock, but left the stones composing the altar untouched except so far as to move them into position. But much may turn on this exception, much more than Barton appears to realize. That the early custom of leaving sacred stones unworked rested on the belief that a numen inhabited the sacred stone may be granted, and consequently that the custom of using tools upon the *same* stones is later, and due to a weakening of the original belief; it consequently follows further that the taboo introduced into the Hebrew law of the altar forbidding the use of tool (חרבך) or iron (ברזל) upon the stones composing it springs *ultimately* from a *belief* more ancient than the *practice* of fashioning natural rock surfaces once regarded as housing a numen. But it does not prove that the *Hebrews* in particular or perhaps that any other people used *altars* built of unhewn stones before they used rock surfaces as altars; for (1) the custom of building many unhewn stones into an altar may not be, and pretty obviously is not, coeval with the belief that tools must not be used on numen-inhabited stones; on the other hand, *many* stones will only have been built into a single altar *after* the belief had weakened that these particular stones were numen-inhabited; for we may surely believe that the numens in all these stones would have resented being all huddled together into an altar heap as much as having their house trimmed with a tool. In other words, the altar of unhewn stones dates from a time when the avoidance of trimming a stone containing a numen—a bethel—was extended, through weakening of the belief, to stones used for any sacred purpose; and (2) the rock surfaces were not necessarily still regarded as necessarily numen-inhabited when they were cut to be more adapted for use as a form of altar.

And turning now to the Hebrews in particular, we may say

with some assurance that they rejected rock-surfaces and single stone altars in favour of constructed altars of earth or stone; i.e. they did not continue to use certain types of altar which had prevailed in Canaan long before they entered the country, continued to be used by Canaanites after the Hebrew immigration, and were probably, in common with other Canaanite sacrificial customs, adopted for a time by the Hebrews themselves.

The narratives in Judges and Samuel show us the process of replacement; the built altar comes in where the unbuilt altar had been previously used; and this process of replacement must have begun in the somewhat early days of the settlement, not only on account of the direct evidence of the stories of Gideon, Manoah, and Saul, but because the process must have been fairly complete by the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., for the narratives both of J and E regularly represent the patriarchs as *building* altars, never as utilizing, like Gideon and Manoah, existing rocks.[1]

The question arises: does the law in Ex. $20^{24 f.}$ stand in relation to these earlier Canaanite customs? In requiring altars built of earth, or if of stone of unhewn stone, and in either case without steps, is it tacitly setting itself against the still continued use of ancient types of altar in which by steps cut in the rock access was obtained to a suitable natural rock surface, or single stones were employed as an altar? Or is it intended to secure the continuance of a long-existing dominant custom of altars of earth or unhewn stone against a *new* tendency to erect elaborate artificial altars? Is the author of the law, as Baentsch[2] puts it, 'a foe of the luxurious cultus as it certainly prevailed in the great sanctuaries of the northern kingdom', i.e. a foe of new methods sprung from increasing wealth in national life; or a foe of *certain* ancient forms of cultus? The probable age of the law admits of either view.

In any case, whether this particular law sets its face against certain simple and natural forms of altar or not, the fact remains that rock surfaces and single stones once used in Canaan, and probably in some measure at least by the Hebrews, fell into disuse among the Hebrews. Why? Not simply on account of their simplicity, which offended the taste and fell below the

[1] Gen. 15 offers a *possible* exception. [2] ad loc.

capacity of a later and more luxurious age? For these simpler altars fell into disuse while the other types equally simple, viz. rude altars of stone, if not also of earth, survived. May we see in the abandonment of the single stone and rock surface an opposition to beliefs disapproved and yet more easily suggested by these? Is the disuse of the single stone as altar allied to the opposition to the single stone as maṣṣebah? Is the opposition to the rock altar due to the closer association of these with local numina?

Along some such lines as these we may most probably trace what was certainly a change of custom. As to the rock-surface altar, it may well have served more than one type of religious thought; and Kittel has attempted a history of its use from this point of view.[1] In so far as these surfaces are connected with subterranean hollows they may have served to facilitate offerings to earth-housing deities below, and in origin this usage may go back to pre-Semitic inhabitants of Canaan, *c.* 2500 B.C. and earlier; archaeology at least seems to indicate the possibility of such a use at this remote period. Next, according to Kittel, comes a period of Semitic worship of Baal falling into two periods: in the first, say from 2500 to 1500 B.C., these same rock surfaces or tables and others are used for setting forth of fruits on their surface, and for the pouring of libations into the hollows, to be retained there for the Baal or local numen that houses not under but on earth. About 1500 B.C., as excavation at Megiddo has shown, altars of burnt-offering come into use; the new form of altar, he suggests, corresponds to a new conception of Ba'al as Sun God, perhaps under the influence of Crete, whence also came the altar of burnt-offering appropriate to the new belief. Now if the old rock surfaces were converted to the use of altars of burnt offering, they serve as the base merely of the altar constructed upon them, like the Jewish altar on the ancient rock in Jerusalem; or in some cases perhaps the rock surface may itself have been so used, but to the manifest neglect of the original purpose of the hollows in its surface; at Ṣor'ah, e.g., there is no room for the burning of a carcase except by allowing it to cover the hollow. But what of the Hebrews in this outline history of the evolution of rock table into the altar of burnt-

[1] *op. cit.*, p. 152.

offering? For the evolution seems complete before they enter Canaan. But while the evolution was complete, ancient as well as younger types of altar remained in use. This is obvious from the story of Gideon, where the broth is still poured out on the rock to fill, as we may believe, the hollows in it, and the meat and meal set down but not burnt on the unhollowed part of the surface. The question then becomes: how did the Hebrews treat differences in existing types of altar? In the later Hebrew cultus the blood ritual at the altar—not as with Gideon at home—comes in with a modification of the earlier practice, perhaps particularly of the desert, of the slaughter stone, though the single stone itself is discontinued—possibly for a reason which I have already suggested; the later Canaanite practice of burning the victim on the altar, or at least certain parts of it, is adopted to the necessary exclusion of the practice of merely depositing food as for human consumption on the altar; though this practice of the god's table perpetuates itself in at least one important survival in Hebrew ritual—the Table of the Presence. The Hebrew law in its insistence on a structural altar, to the neglect, possibly with the positive but tacit disapproval, of the table-like rock-surfaces with their cup and channels, is accommodated to the Hebrew conception of God as housing neither below, nor on the earth, but in heaven; the smoke ascending from the altar ascends towards him; the burnt carcasses are offerings to him, but are no longer his food, except in the sense that the food is eaten by his ministrants at his altar.

# IX

## LATER HISTORY

THE later history of the Jewish altar is mainly confined to Jerusalem. The law of Deuteronomy required, and the Reformation of Josiah at the end of the seventh century B.C. aimed at, the abolition of all altars of burnt-offering, except that of the Temple on Mount Zion. Certainly the Reformation in this respect was not immediately and permanently completely successful; in particular, between the death of Josiah and the fall of Jerusalem twenty years later the use of other altars revived, and these were used in the service of Yahweh. It was otherwise with the altars in town and country forced on such Jews as were prepared to acquiesce in his regulations by Antiochus Epiphanes; and the altar thrown down by Mattathias at Modin, one of many like it, had been intended for the service of another God. Outside Palestine, as is now known, an altar of burnt-offering existed at Elephantine from before 525 B.C. to 411 B.C.; and three years or more later the Jewish community there received permission from the Persian government to re-erect the altar and to offer on it meal-offerings and incense, though permission to offer as formerly burnt-offerings also is not given. Again, from about 160 B.C. to A.D. 73 at the temple erected by the refugee high priest Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt, an altar existed on which sacrifices were offered. But the last-mentioned altar, like the temple to which it was attached, no doubt closely followed the model of Jerusalem; and of the altar at Elephantine we have no details. We may, with this brief reference to others, confine ourselves now to the altars of Jerusalem: i.e. ultimately the one altar of burnt-offering without and the altar of incense within the Temple.

As at Ophrah the first construction of an altar for the service of Yahweh was attributed to Gideon, so at Jerusalem to David; and as at Ṣor'ah there stands to-day on or near the site of

Manoah's sacrifice a natural rock altar, so on or near the site of the altar erected by David there exists a massive outcrop of rock bearing various traces of artificial workings; this rock, which has for the last 1,200 years been covered by the great Moslem building, the Dome of the Rock, has for long, in all discussions, been brought into association with the altar and Temple of Jerusalem; and rightly, the only question open being the precise nature of the association.

The earliest record of the Jewish altar of Jerusalem is in 2 Sam. 24, a narrative of the same nature as Jud. 6, the story of the theophany to Gideon, and his erection of an altar to Yahweh. 'The narrative is', as Budde[1] well remarks, 'first and foremost the *ἱερὸς λόγος* of Yahweh's sanctuary at Jerusalem, the charter for the sacrificial service offered to Yahweh there on Mount Zion. Since now the sanctuary on Zion at last remained the only sanctuary of Yahweh, and became in the conviction of Israel the only one that was legitimate, since later it passed over, transfigured and spiritualized, into the possession of Christianity, and in the N.T. Apocalypse is transferred to the heavenly world, this narrative must be regarded as one of the most important in the entire Old Testament.'

The age of the narrative is not to be too closely defined; on the one hand it rests on popular expansion of certain facts, and is not strictly a contemporary document; on the other, with its companion piece in c. 21, it resembles the earliest narratives of the O.T. and should not be brought lower down than, let us say, the ninth century B. C.

According to this story, then, the pestilence sent as a punishment for David's sin in numbering the people raged from Dan to Beersheba, leaving Jerusalem at first untouched; but then the destroying angel stretched out his hand to smite Jerusalem too, standing as he did so *beside* (עם) the threshing-floor of Araunah; but at that spot his destroying power is stayed by Yahweh, and Jerusalem escapes. *In* (ב) the threshing-floor *beside* which the angel has stood David is instructed to erect an altar to Yahweh (הקם ליי מזבח, 2 Sam. 24[18]), and does so, building it (ויבן שם מ ליי v. 25) and offering on it burnt-offerings.

[1] ad loc.

In Samuel the site of this altar is not more closely defined by reference to features in the topography of Jerusalem which can still be determined; but the whole tenor of the story, even in the earliest form in Samuel, suggests what the much-modified form of the story in Chronicles affirms, that the site of David's altar *in* the threshing-floor of Araunah was within the site of Solomon's Temple (בית יי) including its courts, and consequently of the successive temples of Zerubbabel and Herod: 'And Solomon began to build the house of Yahweh in Jerusalem in Mount Moriah where Yahweh (so LXX) had appeared unto David his father "in the place which David had prepared" (LXX) in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite' (2 Chron. 3[1]).

I assume as proved that the Mount Moriah of Chronicles, more commonly called in the O.T. Mount Zion, is the eastern of the two hills or ridges of which Jerusalem consists, and that the Temple lay above the old Jebusite fortress, renamed after its capture, the city of David. On this loftier, plateau-like portion of the hill, nearly midway across from the eastern edge of the plateau, above the deep valley of the Kidron, to the western edge above the shallower Tyropoean valley lies the famous rock now covered by the so-called mosque of Omar. The Jebusites must have had an altar, and it would have been entirely in common with suggestions of such narratives as that in 1 Sam. 9 of Samuel's sacrifice at Ramah that this Jebusite altar lay *above* the Jebusite city itself; it is natural then to see in the remarkable rock on the plateau about a quarter of a mile away from the site of the old Jebusite city an ancient Jebusite altar; for there are features, in at all events the *present* surface, which make it resemble the rock altars of Megiddo, Ṣor'ah, and other places, and which would render it suitable to the kind of ancient sacrificial use to which the story of the rock at Ophrah points; and it would be in accordance with a common law of religious history that a place sacred in one cult continues to be sacred in a later cult that replaces it. On these grounds it is now commonly held that the rock was in the first instance a Jebusite altar, on which the pre-Hebrew inhabitants of Jerusalem set forth food and poured out liquids for the deity. The narrative of 2 Sam. 24, it is true, does not, as in the case of the rock at

Ophrah, in any way suggest this earlier religious use; and Budde is inclined to draw the conclusion that such use there had not been. 'The chapter', he remarks,[1] 'forms a companion piece to the stories of the foundation of (the) sanctuaries . . . of Beersheba, Bethel, Mizpah, Ophrah. Which is the most ancient? Was Jerusalem compelled to justify its origin because these other sanctuaries had such charters to show, or vice versa? The former alternative seems obvious, but is not really so. For the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* of these other sanctuaries served to wipe out the stain of earlier heathen worship at them: this Jerusalem had no need to do, since it was founded on a threshing-floor, which had never persistently served any sacred purpose. In any case, on this in part rested Jerusalem's claim to rank above the others.'[2]

If the rock had a prior history as a Jebusite altar, how closely were the earlier Jebusite and the later Jewish altar connected? Among those who identify the site of the Temple with the immediate neighbourhood of the rock, there is, as is well known, a difference of theory in detail; some holding that the rock was enclosed and covered, as now by the Dome of the Rock, so formerly by the Temple, and in particular by the Holy of Holies; others that the Temple itself stood to the west of the rock, the rock forming the basis of the later-constructed Jewish altars. Both theories have some difficulties to meet: the area of the rock is too great to have been covered by the Holy of Holies: on the other hand, if the Temple is placed west of the rock, it is necessary to conclude that it rested on extensive substructures: and, further, if we must limit the actual threshing-floor (גרן) to the actual circular area trodden by the oxen engaged in threshing, the rock and the threshing-floor would coincide: but the rock with its uneven surface is unsuitable for oxen treading out corn. On the other hand, a point sometimes urged in favour of identifying rock and altar, viz. that angels in the O.T. appear on rocks, really turns against the theory, for the angel appears close to (עם) but not *in* the threshing-floor: if then the angel appeared *on*, or (1 Chron. $21^{16}$) hovering above the rock, the threshing-floor on which the altar was erected was neither on nor included the rock, but was simply contiguous to it; in this case we should naturally think of the threshing-floor and altar as south

[1] *Samuel*, *KHC.*, p. 327. [2] Freely translated and slightly condensed.

of the rock and contiguous to it—the first plot of ground over which the destroying angel in approaching Jerusalem did not pass.

To enter further into theories of the exact site of the Temple and the altar is unnecessary: for our present purpose we need to note (1) that the narrative of 2 Sam. 24 certainly recognizes no *Hebrew* use of natural rock on Mount Zion as an altar; (2) that it attributes to David, i.e. to the earliest days of the Hebrew occupation of Zion, the *construction* of an altar of burnt-offering, though, as in many similar narratives of altar building, not specifying the material, whether earth or stone; but (3) the narrator probably had in view a *stone* altar, and in any case an altar with a continuous history to his own day: the story is told not like that of Saul at Michmash in 1 Sam. $14^{32-35}$ of an altar used for the nonce on a battlefield, but of an altar built close to a town *on* a particular occasion indeed, but not merely *for* a particular occasion;[1] the whole point of it is rather to describe the origin of not a natural but a constructed altar existing in the story-teller's own day; (4) consequently, as early as this story took shape, i.e. probably before the ninth century B.C., there existed on Mount Zion in connexion with the Temple a *built* altar. If I seem to labour the point, the reason will become clear as I pass to the altar of Solomon's Temple and a particular theory recently put forward with regard to it.

An altar existed and sacrifices were offered on Mount Zion before any temple was built, just as in many places altars continued to stand without temples. The *Temple* on Zion was the work of Solomon; the *origin* of *altar* and worship there was attributed to David. But what part had Solomon in the *history* of the altar? What altar, what form of altar, stood before his completed Temple? The question arises because, somewhat remarkably, in the full account of the Temple building and its furniture in 1 Kings 6 and 7 no account is given of the altar of burnt-offering.[2] In the following chapters (8 ff.) there are incidental allusions to such an altar; that is all. The first records that Solomon, when

[1] The chronicler's inference is correct, 1 Chron. $22^{1}$.

[2] Altar in 1 Kings $6^{20, 22}$ is the table of shewbread (but ? text). The omission in Kings is made good in 2 Chron. $4^{1}$, which inserts before the account of the molten sea the statement that Solomon made an altar of bronze, giving its dimensions.

he prayed at the dedication of the Temple, stood before the altar of Yahweh, and at the conclusion of his prayer 'arose from before the altar of Yahweh' ($8^{22, 54}$). These allusions occurring in a Deuteronomic passage merely imply that three or four centuries later than Solomon it was understood that an altar stood before the Temple as Solomon completed it. In $8^{64}$ it is recorded of the same day: 'the king on that day sanctified the middle of the court that was before the house of Yahweh: for there he offered the burnt-offering, and the meal-offering, and the fat of the peace-offerings: because the bronze altar that was before Yahweh was too little to receive the burnt-offerings, and the meal-offering, and the fat of the peace-offerings'. This passage is at least less obviously Deuteronomic than those last mentioned, and may be earlier. The implications as to the *theory* of the writer, whatever his age and whether his theory accords with fact or not, are interesting—they are these: (1) that at the completion of the Temple there stood before it an altar of *bronze*; (2) that this altar was intended normally for burnt-offerings and other sacrificial portions requiring to be burnt in the altar fire; but (3) that its size was unequal to the vast offerings made by Solomon on this occasion—22,000 oxen, or 120,000 small cattle; and therefore (4) that Solomon utilized for the occasion an ampler space in the Temple court—apparently without erecting temporary altars for the occasion. The remaining allusion to the altar ($9^{25}$) occurs in a passage of relatively early date, though the actual verse is regard by some (e.g. Stade) as an addition. This records that 'three times a year did Solomon offer burnt-offerings and peace-offerings upon the altar which he had built unto Yahweh'.[1] The implications of this and the preceding notice are perhaps inconsistent: here, and here only, is Solomon recorded to have himself constructed an altar; so far, of course, this is merely additional information to that contained in the previous notice, and in no way inconsistent with it: but it has been urged (W. R. Smith) that the verb *build* is unsuitable to a bronze altar; it is not clear that this objection is insurmountable, though it may be admitted that 'build' in this connexion most naturally suggests stone as the material of at least part of the altar: the alternative, an

[1] $9^{25\,b}$ is corrupt and unintelligible.

earthen altar, would be unlikely for so prominent and important an altar.

Certainly the apparent absence in Kings of an *account* of the altar and the nature of the *allusions* to it reasonably raise questions. Different types of solution have been suggested.

1. A literary solution. It has been suggested that an account of the altar stood in the original narrative and has been suppressed. If this theory[1] were correct, which, at least as the theory is commonly stated, is very doubtful,[2] it would leave open the historical question of what material was this altar, and what was its manner.

2. An exegetical solution. It has been argued by W. R. Smith[3] that the absence of a description of the altar is only apparent, being due to misinterpretation, not real. The altar made by Solomon for the Temple really was of bronze, and consisted of one of the two lofty bronze pillars Yachin and Boaz placed at the porch of the Temple, and described in 1 Kings $7^{15-22}$; Smith suggested that in the bowl-shaped top of the pillar the fat of the peace-offerings was burnt, whereas whole burnt-offerings were burnt on pyres of wood erected from time to time in the middle of the court (cp. 1 Kings $8^{64}$).

3. The third solution we may term historical. On this theory no description is given of an altar constructed by Solomon, for the reason that, in spite of 1 Kings $9^{25}$, he constructed no altar, but utilized for the Temple a previously existing altar. This theory takes two very different forms.

(*a*) It has been suggested by Skinner (*Ki.*, p. 155), and argued especially by G. A. Smith,[4] that the altar of Solomon's Temple consisted simply of the great rock, that the king utilized a natural surface, previously perhaps used by the Jebusites, instead of building an altar of stones or casting one of bronze.

(*b*) Or we may suppose that Solomon used the altar of stones built by David his father on the threshing-floor of Araunah.[5]

Of these two the second seems the more likely to be correct,

[1] Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, *E.T.*, p. 44 n., also Addis, *E.B.* i. 124.

[2] Burney, 102 f.; Skinner, *Kings Cent. B.*, p. 155.

[3] *Rel. Sem.*[1], 358 f., 468. [4] *Jerusalem*, ii., pp. 60, 64.

[5] This was distinct from the horned altar (1 Kings $1^{51}$, $2^{28\,f.}$) in the 'city of David' (2 Sam. $6^{16\,f.}$) attached to the tent that screened the ark.

though whether in itself sufficient to explain all the facts is another question. If without building a fresh altar from its foundation, Solomon enlarged or modified the altar built by his father, the description of it might have seemed out of place in the record of the construction of the Temple and its appointments, and yet at the same time he might perhaps, according to the usage of the Hebrew בנה, have been said allusively, as he is said in 1 Kings $9^{25}$, to have *built* an altar: but if the bronze altar attributed to Solomon's Temple (1 Kings $8^{64}$) even so far corresponds to fact that on the existing stone altar Solomon himself placed a bronze hearth, we might still have expected this bronze hearth to be included in the description of the Temple and its appurtenances, and we might still have to consider the possibility of the description of such an object having been deleted from the original text. In any case, we have a specific account of the building of an altar—presumably of stone—before Solomon, and allusions, but no specific account, of a bronze altar existing prior to the time of Ahaz, and, indeed, as early as Solomon. Against the theory that Solomon merely utilized the rock there are weighty considerations. It would be very remarkable for Solomon, whose tendency was towards the artificial and the magnificent, not the natural and the simple, to have reverted from the use of a constructed altar to the use of a natural rock; and even if the story in 2 Sam. 24 be so far discredited as to throw doubt on the fact of David having constructed an altar, the fact remains that the story is early, and yet is told to explain the existence of a built altar existing at the time of the origin of the story. If this altar did not originate with David or Solomon, with whom did it? We may go further and consider the matter in the light of the transition from natural to constructed altars, elsewhere discussed in the last lecture; this transition is certainly referred to pre-Solomonic times, and though the literary form of the stories is of course not contemporary, the stories or legends on which the stories rest, and of which the *building* of an altar is the very substance, must be ancient. In the light of this and the general elaboration of the Solomonic Temple and its appurtenances, it seems in the highest degree improbable that so important a feature as the altar was mere rude rock. These objections would not apply to

the exceptional case on a day of multitudinous sacrifices, such as the day of dedication of the rock for the sacrifices: 'the middle of the court' which Solomon used on that occasion may have consisted of or included the rock.

We may with less confidence and yet with probability go farther, and conclude that Solomon had constructed what passes by the name of the altar of bronze.[1] Such an altar stood in front of the Temple in the time of Ahaz (*c.* 735 B.C.: 2 Kings $16^{14}$), and was removed by him, i.e. it was already of *some* antiquity in his time; and, again, there is no one between Ahaz and Solomon to whom its construction can be so plausibly assigned as to Solomon himself. Both allusions (1 Kings $8^{64}$ and 2 Kings $16^{14\,f.}$) imply that this bronze altar was relatively small. Whether it stood by itself, or on a stone substructure, or on the great rock, and in that case what particular part of the great rock it occupied, are questions which have been investigated in great detail, e.g. by Kittel, but with quite inconclusive results.

If, however, we may now conclude that the altar before the Temple from the time of Solomon consisted in whole or in part of bronze till it was replaced or supplemented, as 2 Kings $16^{15}$ directly affirms, by an altar *built*—presumably of stone—at the direction of Ahaz, we see how deeply other motives and ideas affected this central feature of the cultus. If worked stones represent a departure from the primitive unworked material enjoined by the law, *a fortiori* bronze; and even if Ahaz built an altar in the right material—stone—he built it on the model of a heathen altar seen in Damascus; and of stone rather than of bronze probably on account of its much greater dimensions. These two questionable altars appear to have served through the entire period from Solomon to the Exile; Solomon seeking after magnificence and costliness and the Assyrian-minded Ahaz gave a certain foreign character to the altar of what was at first indeed, in a measure, the king's chapel, but became the one legitimate place of sacrificial worship.

[1] 2 Chron. $4^{1}$ directly affirms that Solomon made a bronze altar which consisted of a square 20 × 20 × 20 ells in measurement, but this is probably, so far as measurement goes, inference from the measurements of the altar of the second temple (Kit., *Studien*, p. 63), cp. Ezek. $43^{13\,f.}$.

The increase in size of the altar in the time of Ahaz is also of nterest; for it corresponds, perhaps, to the increasing numbers f sacrificial victims commonly, and not as in Solomon's time on single special occasion, offered on the altar in Jerusalem, to hich Isaiah, the contemporary of Ahaz, appears to refer.[1]

In connexion with the Exile there arise questions both of ractice and theory which must be only briefly referred to. The ggestion has been made that though we must assume that ebuchadrezzar destroyed the altar as well as the Temple, the ck remained, and may have been utilized.[2] But if any such se was made of the rock or some provisional altar during the xile, the need for a new altar was felt by those who returned om the Exile: and in the Exile the altar of the future had been ne subject of theory.

Of the material of the altar designed for the new Temple zekiel[3] says nothing. It seems probable that he had stone n view; but whether unhewn stone, as the law of Ex. $20^{25}$ equired, is doubtful, for the exact measurements he gives ggest more naturally finished rather than rough surfaces, and ertainly in another respect the altar he imagines flagrantly iolates that law in Ex. 20. Exodus ($20^{26}$) forbids the altar to e approached by steps; Ezekiel requires steps, and directs that ney shall face eastwards. Ezekiel's interest is not in material ut, as it is predominantly with the Temple also, in form and imensions. The altar is to consist of four squares of diminishing ze superimposed the one on the other; the uppermost of these a square of 12 cubits (= 18 ft.); and 12 cubits is the height om the base to the top of the horns standing at the four orners. In this recurrence of the measurement 12 we may afely trace numerical symbolism; and the symbolism is more robably due to Ezekiel than repeated by him from the actual nape and dimensions of the pre-exilic altar, though on this oint we cannot speak with certainty, since we have no trust-worthy records of either the shape or dimensions of the earlier ltar; the statement in 2 Chron. $4^1$ that Solomon's altar was square of 20 cubits may be more safely taken as evidence for

[1] Is. $1^{11}$ ff.; cp. Kit., op. cit., pp. 62 ff., who questions the measurements ttributed to Solomon's altar in 2 Chron. $4^1$.

[2] Kit., op. cit., 67 f. [3] $43^{13-17}$.

the altar of the Chronicler's own time than for that of Solomon the more so that the same figures are given by Hecataeus (Jos *Cont. Ap.* i. 22)[1]—say third century B.C. Ezekiel's theory o shape and later practice in regard to it agree; Chronicles and Hecataeus show that the pre-Maccabaean altar was square the Maccabaean altar resembled the pre-Maccabaean;[2] and Josephus and the Mishnah attest the squareness of the altar o Herod's Temple; and, according to the Mishnah, this last Jewish altar resembled Ezekiel's in consisting of squares placed upon squares, though of three squares only, not four, and in the part played by numerical symbolism; the top square being twice the size of Ezekiel's, i.e. $(12 \times 2) \times (12 \times 2)$, and the height to the *base* of the horns 6 cubits. Into the question of the actual dimensions of the later Temple, whether they were those given by the Mishnah or the very different dimensions given by Josephus $(50 \times 50 \times 15)$, we need not enter now. Suffice it that, judged by any of the descriptions, the altar erected by the Maccabees still more the altar of the Herodian Temple, was a most imposing structure, and in size corresponded not inadequately to the greater position that Jerusalem attained, as the Jewish community dispersed throughout the world increased in numbers and the worshippers coming from far and near multiplied.

For theory as to the material of the altar we turn to the Priestly Code, for the Tabernacle and its altar in P are theory and idea clothed in historical form, as are the Temple and altar of Ezekiel theory and idea clothed in the form of prediction; both of course being in greater or less measure governed by the actual facts of the first Temple. In attributing to the Tabernacle a wooden altar plated with bronze, the Priestly writer may have been determined merely by a desire to fill in the picture of the past, when Israel was moving from place to place, with an altar resembling the altar of Solomon in being of bronze, but hollow and of a size $(5 \times 5 \times 3)$ suitable for carrying. Even so, P shows himself as indifferent as Ezekiel to the law of Ex. 20, for that this portable bronze-plated box altar was at every fresh encampment filled up with earth is certainly not the thought of P, and is nothing more than a rather desperate harmonistic theory which is even so inadequate to its task;

[1] Schürer. [2] 1 Macc. $4^{47}$.

r to shovel mould into a box is not to *build* with earth. But is possible that P does not picture the wilderness altar as ronze-plated merely because Solomon's altar was bronze, but ecause he held the theory that the altar of the future ought be of bronze: if so, this theory in this respect failed to affect ractice. On the other hand, whereas the imaginary altar of P nd the actual altar of the first Temple in so far as they were ronze, and in so far as they were stone, if they were of hewn one, violated the early law of Ex. 20, the altars of the second nd third Temples deliberately followed it, being guided by the xplicit command of the early code in lieu of any other explicit mmand, P providing an historic example of a different form of ar, but no actual law on the subject. That the Maccabaean ar and the altar of the Herodian Temple were constructed of hewn stones is certain, that the pre-Maccabaean altar even far back as Zerubbabel was similarly constructed is a probable ference. The ancient altar, presumably that erected three-d-a-half centuries previously by Zerubbabel,[1] having been ofaned by the heathen altar, the abomination of desolation, hich had been placed upon it, the priests appointed by Judas cleanse the holy place decided to pull it down; 'and', the rrative of 1 Macc. $4^{45}$ continues, 'they pulled down the altar, d laid down the stones in a convenient place until a prophet ould come and decide about them. And they took whole ones according to the Law, and built an altar according to the rmer one'; i.e. in the matter of material they followed the plicit direction of the Law, and in other matters—plan, e, &c. not defined in the Law—they carefully copied the old ar; though not certain, it seems probable that the old altar, hich was certainly of stone, was also like the new of *unhewn* nes. If we accept the evidence of Hecataeus as quoted by sephus in *Cont. Ap.* i. 22 as good for the third century B.C., it directly attested that the pre-Maccabaean altar was built 'not hewn stones but of white stones gathered together'. For the t that the stones of the altar of the third Temple were unhewn have the evidence of Philo (*De Vict. Off.* 4), Josephus (*Wars*, $5^{6}$), and the Mishnah (Mid. $3^{4}$). The original reason for leaving ered stones uncut—viz. that the numen housed within it—must,

[1] Ezr. $3^{5}$; cp. Hag. $2^{13}$.

as I suggested in the last lecture, have weakened before many such stones were brought together in an altar structure. To the Maccabees, like so many other matters in ritual to the later Rabbis, the only and sufficient reason for leaving the stones unworked was that this was commanded in the Law: but from an interesting 'hedge' supplied to this law in the Mishnah we see that later again the meaning of the Law was so far considered that it was found in the naturalness of the material required and in order to secure this naturalness unimpaired the Mishnah requires that the stones must not only be whole and unhewn, but dug out of virgin soil (חופרין למטה מן הבתולה, Mid. $3^4$)—i.e. soil that had not previously been ploughed, for the plough in passing over the soil might have cut the stones subsequently dug up for the building of the temple.

But the objection to worked material, even to worked metal did not hold good in regard to the other altar that formed so significant a feature of the later Temple. And possibly in the material which remained undisputed as the correct material for the altar of incense, or, as it is otherwise called, the golden altar, or the inner altar,[1] we may see a certain effect of the theory of P, which saw in another metal, bronze, the ideal material for the altar of burnt-offering.

The history of the altar of incense is far briefer and simpler than that of the altar of burnt-offering. It has long been a matter of common agreement[2] that in the Pentateuch the only references to this altar occur exclusively in secondary strata of the Priestly Code, and that other references to it in the O.T. are no earlier. On the other hand, in Pss. and Chron. in the O.T. in 1 Macc. ($1^{21}$, $4^{49}$) and certain other apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, in the N.T., Philo, Josephus, and the Mishnah, the references are frequent. Now it is no mere *argumentum e silentio* that the altar of incense did not exist much if at all earlier than the earliest of these references—let us say not earlier than the fourth or fifth century B.C.; the argument from silence is reinforced and clinched by the fact that in $P^{ss}$ movable censers carried into the Holy Place by the priests sufficiently play the part of the

[1] References to Mishnah in Schürer, II. i. 281, n. 225

[2] Otherwise Orelli in *PRE*, *Rauchenaltar*.

altar of incense. Consequently the inference drawn from Hebrew literature is not to be withdrawn out of regard to more recent discoveries of actual incense-altars in Palestine—as it has become necessary to call them—on the sites opened up by excavation. Of these the most notable example is the incense-altar of Tell Ta'annek; but others similar have been found elsewhere. The differences between these and the Jewish altar of incense are more remarkable than the resemblances, extending to shape, material, and method of use. In shape the Jewish altar of incense resembles and was probably, so far, a model in miniature of the altar of burnt-offering: like that altar it is square with a flat upper surface and horned—1 × 1 cubits and 2 feet high; the discovered incense-altars are tall shafts—that of Tell Ta'annek, for example, being in shape 'roughly like a truncated pyramid . . .' and the whole ending at the top in a (circular) bowl one foot in diameter.[1] The difference in shape corresponds to difference in method of use: the Jewish altar of incense was a piece of furniture *fixed* in the Holy Place; and on its top surface fire taken from off the altar of burnt-offering was placed, in which the fragrant substance was burnt. The discovered altars are movable and apparently were placed *over* a fire previously kindled on the ground, the necessary draught for which was furnished by holes in the side of the so-called altar: the aromatics were placed in the bowl at the top which was heated by the fire beneath and within. The material of the discovered altars is clay, that of Tell Ta'annek in particular of terra-cotta, these objects being thus in shape, material, and method of use similar to the modern Palestinian *tannur* or oven: the Jewish altar of incense was gold-plated. The age of the discovered altars seems to be about 700 B.C.; the evidence seems to point to the Jewish altar being some centuries later. But however that may be, from the comparison just briefly drawn it would appear that the Jewish altar is not at all closely related to or derived from these. For calling these discovered objects *altars* there is of course no evidence: we may suspect that some term derived from the root קטר[2] was anciently

[1] Cp. the shape and bowl top of altar at Sinai—Petrie, *Sinai*, p. 134, no. 3. Dr., *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible*, p. 85.

[2] Sellin, *Tell Ta'annek*, suggests אריאל.

applied to them. On the other hand, the application of the term מזבח, slaughter-place, to the Jewish gold-plated square piece of furniture is a striking illustration of the extent to which the term used for manipulation of sacred offerings to God had travelled from its primary meaning of 'place of slaughter'.

For the existence of two altars—a larger and a smaller and more costly—in the same temple, we have a parallel in the Babylonian temple as described by Herodotus (i. 183). But to say, as Barton does,[1] that these correspond to the altar of burnt-offering and altar of incense is misleading: the correspondence extends only to size and in part at least to material, not to function. What Herodotus says is that in the temple at Babylon there is an altar of gold: and there is also another altar of great size, where full-grown animals are sacrificed, whereas on the golden altar it is not lawful to sacrifice any but young sucklings only, and also on the larger altar the Chaldeans offer the thousand talents of frankincense every year, &c. In some important respects the functions of the two altars in Babylon and Jerusalem are reversed.

The age of the origin of the altar of incense must not of course be confused with the age of the introduction of incense into Jewish worship; this was certainly earlier, perhaps centuries earlier, and at Elephantine the offering of incense (לבנה) on the same altar as that on which burnt-offerings were offered may be most naturally explained as directly derived from pre-exilic Palestine both in respect of the use of incense and of the single altar. In any case, the altar of incense which subsequently stood in the Holy Place was not essential to the use of incense; and as indication of the later development of the altar it is to be observed that even after the introduction of this altar, while *it* was reserved exclusively for the burning of incense, the burning of incense was not confined to this altar; to the last at Jerusalem, as at Elephantine, the incense mingled with a meal-offering was burnt on the altar of burnt-offering.

We may then conclude that the altar of incense came into existence not much earlier than P[c] or, let us say, the fifth century B.C.: but is it even so early as this? or is the altar of P[c] still

[1] *ERE* i. 353 a.

heory, the programme of a school which had to wait perhaps century or two before the programme was carried out? The bsence of reference to it by the Pseudo-Hecataeus[1] has some-mes been treated as evidence that it did not yet exist towards he close of the third century B.C.; before the middle of the next entury, however, according to 1 Macc. $1^{21}$ (cp. $4^{49}$), the golden ltar was among the plunder carried off by Antiochus.

We may say, then, that for the last two or three, perhaps for he last four or five, centuries of the Temple but not probably onger, it had two altars—one of great size, built of natural un-rimmed stone, standing in front of the Temple under the open eaven, on which a fire burned which was never suffered to go ut, and from which daily there rolled up the heavy smoke of urning carcasses, with which there mingled at times the smoke f small quantities of incense; the other of small size, constructed ithin of wood but covered with the costliest of all metals, standing ithin the Temple, in the centre of the Holy Place before the veil hat screened off the Holy of Holies, on which no fire of its own ver burned, but from which there ascended daily at morning and vening the smoke of fragrant substances and never any other. his smaller altar is in a sense strictly derivative from and ependent on the larger; it is designated by the same term מזבח hough unlike the other it has no relation at all to slaughtered ictims or even to offerings that could be slaughtered; as an altar comes under the Law that no altar must be erected outside of ion; and consequently the altar of incense was not repeated hile the Temple stood, nor after its fall in synagogue worship, itable as the symbolism of its ritual might have seemed to that orship; from the great altar, coals were daily brought and laced on the smaller; it had no fire of its own; annually, like he other altar, its horns were expiated with the blood of a victim lain beside and burnt upon that other. And yet in the costli-ess of its material and in the refinement of its purpose it differs n a way that fastened on the minds of some who meditated on he meaning of these sacrificial customs. The symbolism which carcely gave rise to it but was rather obviously suggested by it—hat of prayers ascending to God—is already seized by the N.T.

[1] Cp. Schürer, loc. cit.

Apocalyptist in his reference to the heavenly counterpart of the altar of incense. At greater length Philo draws out the suggestions of this altar with a veiled but perceptible relative depreciation of the altar of burnt-offering. He finds proof that God is pleased not even with hecatombs, but with the love of himself and a holy life, in the law of the two altars: 'the Law commanded two altars to be constructed differing in material, place, and purpose; for the one is built up of stones left unhewn as they were gathered, stands under the open sky close by the steps of the Temple, and serves for bloody sacrifices (*τῶν ἐναίμων*), but the golden altar is prepared of the purest metal, stands in the Temple within the first veil, is seen by none save the priests, and of them only in a state of sanctity, and serves for offerings of incense. Whence it is plain that God regards even the smallest offering of incense from a holy man of more worth than a thousand beasts sacrificed by any one who is not altogether nice (*ἀστεῖος*). For, I suppose, as gold is better than useless (*εἰκαίων*) stones, whatever is within is holier than that which is without the fane, by so much is thanksgiving offered by means of incense better than that offered by victims of blood. . . . All which is a symbol only of the fact that with God it is not the number of things slain in sacrifice that is of value, but the entire purity of the rational soul of him that sacrifices.'[1]

Philo has travelled far from the thought that created the rule of natural and readily accessible material for the altar; that which is wrought and costly has for him the deeper meaning. It is true that it is the two altars together, the one of commoner, the other of costlier material, that constitute his symbol. And yet we see perhaps here, as elsewhere in Philo, how readily the altar of burnt-offering might have dropped out of his religion; and if it had dropped out he would not have been very eager to restore it. Both altars have for eighteen centuries disappeared from Jewis ritual. Will both or either ever be restored? I touched on this question three years ago. In the interval the *possibility* of restoration has come nearer. If, as we hope, Jerusalem is permanently delivered from the Turk, will the Jews be enabled to build a temple? If they build a temple, will they

[1] *De Vict. Off.* 4.

furnish it with altar or altars? In the last eighteen centuries animal sacrifice has grown increasingly repugnant: the use of incense has not. Is it likely that, given the opportunity, the Jews will restore the sacrifice of incense, but not that of animals? The history of sacrifice is full of examples of surrogates; of the substitution in certain cases of animals for men, of wine for blood, and after A.D. 70, under the stress of necessity, of prayers for sacrifice. Two considerations however weigh against the probability of restoring the altar that would not, and refraining from restoring the altar that would, offend a sense of fitness that has developed since the fall of Jerusalem: first, the two altars, as we have seen, are most intimately connected, and the service of the altar of incense is dependent on the altar of burnt-offering: and second, in the matter of sacrifice as of much else, the reason and meaning of it has been lost without developing a new reason for its continuance or restoration; the one reason that prevails in Jewish discussion of the subject is that it is a command of God; circumstances have for centuries forced the command of God to be held in abeyance; whether freedom of worship in Jerusalem will be regarded as a sufficient change of circumstances to render sacrifice once again obligatory remains to be seen: but on the whole it seems probable that, given the opportunity, the sacrificial service will be restored wholly or not at all; and that both altars will be rebuilt and used or neither.

# X

## THE SACRIFICIAL SERVICE IN HEAVEN.

### i

In last term's lectures we were concerned with the history more especially of the practice of the Jews in regard to the altar, and in a minor degree with the theory associated with or promoted by this practice. In these concluding lectures I turn exclusively to belief or theory, beliefs in some respects extravagant, apparently remote from practice and reality, and yet illustrative of certain not unimportant ideas of Jewish sacrificial theory and expression.

The history of the Jewish altar is of a movement away from many altars to one, away from altars primarily or exclusively serving a locality, and mostly small localities, to an altar which was the central point and common symbol of the unity of the Jews, though scattered over all parts of the world, in the service of the one true God. On the one altar of burnt-offering in Jerusalem were presented the sacrificial gifts to God including the daily offerings on behalf of the whole community; about this one altar took place the expiatory rites on behalf of the whole community on a great annual celebration of the Day of Atonement; from this one altar ascended daily the smoke of sacrifice towards heaven, the proper abode of God. And the symbolism of the altar ritual had impressed itself upon the imagination and thoughts of the Jews of the Dispersion, who rarely saw the symbols, not less, and in many cases far more, than even on the inhabitants of the Holy City, who were able daily to observe it.

Strictly, the single sanctuary at Jerusalem contained two altars, that of burnt-offering and the golden altar of incense—and as I pointed out in my last lecture, there was with some a certain recoil from the practice of gifts to God in the form of slain

beasts on the altar of burnt-offering, and a greater appreciation of the symbolism of the gifts offered on the costlier altar of burnt-incense. But both altars were alike destroyed in A. D. 70, and thenceforward, as a necessary consequence of the now long-established theory that only on Mount Zion might an altar be erected to God, Jewish sacrificial service ceased. The hope of the restoration of altar and service never died out; sacrifice was, for the Jews, not abolished, but through force of human oppression suspended. Nevertheless, while the memory of the past and the hope of future sacrificial service on Zion continued to affect the thought of the Jews, the actual practice and with it the visible symbolism of the service had ceased.

But before the fall of the Temple on Mount Zion, the destruction of its altar, and the suspension of its sacrificial service took place, Jewish thought had busied itself with another altar that could not be affected or could not at least be directly affected by human movements or by human opposition to the Jews: this was the altar, or again, perhaps, to speak strictly, the two altars, in heaven. It is my present purpose to examine the origin of this idea and, so far as it can be traced, its history: its relation to the Jewish theory of the purpose and efficacy of sacrifice and its influence in early Christian thought.

The belief in a heavenly temple, altar, and sacrificial service is part of the far more general and comprehensive idea of the correspondence of things earthly and things heavenly. As it is above, so is the earth: for the copy of what is in heaven is here on earth.[1] • Cp. Ber. R. i: Whatever is in heaven is also on earth and you will find that whatsoever God created above he created also below: above, a dwelling and a cloud (זבול וערפל): (1) Behold from thy holy dwelling (Is. $63^{15}$): Through the cloud doth he judge (Job $22^{13}$); (2) Then said Solomon: Yahweh hath said he will dwell in the cloud: I have built a dwelling for thee (1 Kings $8^{12f.}$). (1) Above: Yahweh is in his holy temple; (2) Below: the temple of Yahweh. (1) Above: the throne of Yahweh; (2) Below: the throne of glory. (1) Above: And the man clothed with white linen (Ezek. $9^{2}$); (2) Below: With a holy white linen tunic shall he (Aaron) be clothed (Lev. $16^{4}$, &c.).

[1] Cp. Assumption of Isaiah $7^{10}$ (Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 12; *BNT*. p. 66). For Chinese theory in the third millennium B. C., cp. Jeremias, *BNT*. p. 118.

And this *general* idea appears to be very ancient. It has been claimed for a remote antiquity in Babylonian thought, and, in consequence, by Pan-Babylonians for the whole of the ancient world. Leaving what may need to be said further on this point for the present, I remark that the general idea was certainly worked out in different detail in different countries and at different periods, and even at times differently in different centres of the same age and race. And thus the age and origin of the idea in general is a very different question from that of the age and origin of specific developments of it, such as those represented by the belief in a temple, altar, and sacrificial service in heaven. Still, temple and altar on earth are of indefinite antiquity and common to most peoples and religions; and the possibility, though not of course apart from definite and specific proof, of the actual existence and expression of the belief in heavenly counterparts of these must be admitted whenever and wherever the doctrine of the correspondence of earth and heaven prevailed. The way in which the general idea was carried into special applications can be more clearly seen in connexion with early institutions of more special and particular character. And of these Jewish and even late Jewish religion furnishes some striking examples. It is certainly a peculiarly Jewish development to conceive of a heavenly ark of the covenant (Rev. $11^{19}$), though this conceivably might be with the Jews a relatively early development: but peculiarly Jewish also must be the belief in a heavenly Sanhedrin, and this Jewish idea cannot have originated earlier than the Greek period. In other words, among the Jews the general idea of the correspondence of things earthly and things heavenly was undergoing special development and expansion at a quite late period. Does the idea of a heavenly temple, altar, and sacrificial service belong to these later or to earlier developments? With what significant differences are they expressed?

It may first be observed that these ideas just mentioned are closely connected, yet not so closely that they must necessarily all have become explicit at the same time. There was a time in the history of Israel when altars and temples were anything but necessary concomitants; many altars stood in the open attached to no temple: at such a period *if* the *general* doctrine of corre-

spondence had developed the *special* idea of heavenly altars, these also might have stood free of any heavenly temple; and the idea of heavenly temple need not necessarily have found expression. Again, so long as the primary function of an earthly altar was vividly realized to be a place from which the offerings made on earth might ascend in smoke to heaven, it would have been natural, even if the idea of a heavenly temple developed, for such a temple not to be thought of as possessing an altar, at least not an altar of burnt-offering. Such possibilities must be kept in view so long as the existence only of the general idea can be proved or rendered probable apart from proof of the special developments.

Of the special application of the general formula, that all things on earth correspond to things in heaven, to temple, altar, and sacrificial service, there are at least three different forms: of all these we find more or less clear examples at one time or another in Hebrew or Jewish thought; of two at least, less clearly of the third, we find earlier traces in Babylonian literature. Thus, for some of the special applications as well as for the general formula the Jews may have been ultimately indebted to Babylon, though in the working out of the idea not a little most specifically Jewish appears.

1. The temple as the abode on earth of God, or, in polytheistic thought, of the gods, may be regarded as the earthly equivalent of heaven itself,[1] or, more widely, the whole temple area may be regarded as a symbol or reproduction in miniature of the entire cosmos.

In Babylon as early as the time of Gudea, in the third millennium B. C., we find the term or name E-anna,[2] 'heavenly house', applied to the temple; and another similar name is that of the Temple of Nana at Erech, which was called E-khi-li-anna—'house of heavenly glory'. Ḫammurabi (Code ii. 31) says that the temple at Sippar was built *ša ki šu-ba-at ša-ma-i*, i. e. like the heavenly dwelling—*not*, as Jeremias erroneously renders, the heavenly temple (*BNT.* p. 62, but nothing in *ATAO*). Conversely

[1] 'Will God in very deed dwell on earth? Behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee: how much less this house that I have builded?' 1 Kings $8^{27}$.

[2] Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, i. 76.

we find in a hymn to Marduk the temple name E-kur, meaning 'mountain house',[1] used figuratively and in parallelism with heaven: 'in the shining heaven his course is mighty, in E-kur the carefully tended house, is his command highly exalted'.[2] The wider cosmic symbolism of the Babylonian temples may be seen in the custom of erecting on the temple area the staged towers or Zikkurats, symbolizing the world-mountain, the great basin or *apsû* ('molten sea'), symbolizing the Deep, which had its parallel in the Temple of Jerusalem, in the great laver supported on the brazen (bronze) oxen, three looking towards each point of the compass. In this, and in certain other features of Solomon's Temple, we may perhaps see an indication that it was built with a view to cosmic symbolism: in any case such an interpretation was certainly applied to the later Temple of Jerusalem. On this point both Philo and Josephus, though not independently, speak clearly. I shall have occasion to quote what Philo says on this matter in another connexion, I therefore confine myself here to a part of Josephus' description by way of illustration. The general principle Josephus states in these words: 'Each of these (is designed) to imitate and represent the universe: *ἕκαστα γὰρ τούτων εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων*' (*Ant.* iii. 7[7]). The reference in this is to the actual structure (*πῆξιν*) of the tabernacle and its furniture, including the priestly robes, which he has just alluded to. The other parts of the tabernacle, he then goes on to explain, correspond to the earth, sea, and heavens, the first two being accessible to the priests as earth and sea are to man, the third like heaven to God alone. The various items of the furniture and equipment of the Temple have a cosmic significance; amongst other illustrations Josephus instances the *seven* candlesticks corresponding to the *seven* planets: the four materials used for the veils of the Temple signify the four elements—the flax, which grows out of the earth, earth; the purple obtained from a sea shell-fish, water; the blue and the scarlet obviously by their colours suggesting air and fire. Some of the details given in the antiquities with reference to the tabernacle appear also in *De Bell. Jud.* v. 5[4-7] in reference to the Temple, with some

[1 Otherwise Jeremias, *ATAO*, p. 28.]

[2 King, *Creation*, i. p. 207, l. 14; Jastrow, op. cit., i. p. 496.]

differences and some additional references, including a specific reference to the altar of incense and the altar of burnt-offering, but in neither case does he suggest that it is an earthly representation of an exactly similar heavenly object: the altar of burnt-offering he does not interpret symbolically at all; of the altar of incense he says, that 'by its thirteen kinds of sweet-smelling spices with which the sea replenished it, it signified that God is the possessor of all things, whether these be in the habitable or uninhabitable parts of the earth'.

Such a treatment as that of Josephus enables us to see how the idea of correspondence of things earthly and heavenly was applied to the earthly temple without involving, or at least without expressing, the belief in a temple in heaven distinct from heaven itself, still less in an altar employed for sacrificial service in heaven; the seven candlesticks correspond to something in heaven, viz., the planets, but not to candlesticks; so the altar, though Josephus is silent on the point, might have corresponded to something in heaven, though on the analogy of the other correspondences not to an altar. Josephus thus offers us one of two or more different methods of applying the law of correspondence which were influential in the same period, for certain of the contemporaries of Josephus certainly believed in the existence of an actual altar in heaven.

2. I pass to a second form of the belief in the correspondence of things earthly to things heavenly in relation to the temple and the altar. At a very early period in Babylon, at a much later but at a well-defined date among the Jews, we find expression given to the belief that the earthly temple, including in the Jewish account an altar, was built according to instructions given from heaven, these instructions being accompanied by the display of something visible, a building-plan or model. In a certain respect this might pass as the antithesis of the last conception: whereas, according to that, the earthly temple is a miniature reproduction of heaven, according to this it is constructed on a larger scale after a miniature plan or model shown in heaven.

Apart from the reference to the Babylonian temples being built according to the 'heavenly writing'—an idea not immediately related to our present inquiry—ancient Babylonian literature contains one clear reference to a temple built according to

a *building-plan* revealed from heaven. This is in an inscription of King Gudea about 3000 B. C. According to this Gudea dreams a dream in which he sees three heavenly figures who are subsequently identified for him by the goddess Nina as her brother Ningiran, her sister, and Nindub: in the dream the first of these orders Gudea to build a temple, the second reveals to Gudea the construction of the temple, and the third gives the plan of the temple. On a statue of Gudea a building-plan is engraved, held in the lap of Gudea, in another section a builder's stylus and measure are likewise engraved, and these engravings may with probability be referred to the things seen by Gudea in his vision of the temple revealed in *plan* from heaven.[1]

The earliest Jewish parallel to this is remote in time, but in spite of differences presents striking resemblances, and is the more noticeable as coming to us from Ezekiel, the prophet who was resident in Babylon and shows himself in certain respects singularly open to Babylonian ideas. Like Gudea, Ezekiel has a vision of a temple that is to be built, and as Gudea sees a human form which proves to be that of a god drawing the plan of this temple, so Ezekiel sees a form which proves to be that of an angel with a line and, recalling the measure on the statue of Gudea, a measuring reed, measuring before his eyes the dimensions of the temple and its courts and altars; and is instructed to pass on to his countrymen what he has thus been shown, that they may build the temple accordingly ($43^{10, 11}$). 'Son of man,' are his introductory words, 'see with thine eyes and hear with thine ears and pay attention to all that I shew thee . . . and tell the house of Israel all that thou seest' ($40^{4}$): therefore the man measures off, while Ezekiel looks on, the various dimensions of the temple itself, the courts, and the altars: and in conclusion the man repeats the charge to tell all this to the house of Israel, with the addition now of terms (תבנית, תכונה, צורה) covering form and arrangement of parts as well as measurements, and also with the additional charge to write this down in the sight of the people. That is to say, Ezekiel sees, not however in heaven itself, but on the spot on earth on which the actual temple is to be built, a vision of the temple vouchsafed from heaven and explained by a heavenly being, in the light of which he is to

[1] *ATAO* 353 for reproductions, [cp. Jastrow, op. cit. ii. 955 f.].

produce for his people, to guide them in building, a written or engraved plan clearly marking both the form and dimensions of the temple that is to be built. There is, of course, here no word of a temple or altar in heaven of which the Temple on Zion is to be a copy; consequently there can be no suggestion as yet, or at least here, of any sacrificial service carried on in heaven; but there is clearly enough the belief that the earthly temple is made in heaven in the sense that mind covers the architectural idea in all its details of which the earthly temple is the corporeal reproduction—a conception closely similar to certain Babylonian and later Jewish conceptions to which we may return later.

As Ezekiel regards the plan of the future temple as sent from heaven, so P represents the tabernacle as constructed according to what Moses was caused by God to see. Yet here again, what was shown and seen, whatever it was, was seen by Moses, not in heaven, but on Mount Sinai, though it was there shown to him by *God*. Once again, what is seen is of heavenly *origin*, though, as ever, not materialized or located in heaven. One of the terms used by Ezekiel reappears in P. According to him, what Moses was shown was the תבנית, the build or form of the tabernacle and its appointments; the command of God to him is: 'According to all that I am showing thee—the build of the temple and the build of its appointments, so make or construct' (Ex. $25^{9}$, cf. v.$^{40}$). The term 'show' (הראה) may be used metaphorically of what is apprehended, as well as literally of what is seen with the eyes; and in another passage the term *mishpaṭ*, commonly used for law, custom, and in this connexion most naturally meaning some principle of construction, is used of what Moses was shown (Ex. $26^{30}$); 'see that thou erect the tabernacle according to the principle (E.V. fashion) shown thee in the mount'. Still it is most probable that the writer means by 'the build' shown to Moses something seen with his eyes, whether a plan or a model; but even this model, if such it were, is not represented as having its place in heaven; still less is it implied that 'the build' shown to Moses after which he was to construct the earthly altar was itself an altar located in heaven and used in heaven for sacrificial service.

This same term תבנית 'build' is used by the Chronicler (1 Chron. $28^{11-20}$) in relation to the construction of Solomon's Temple, and by him of something that could be given by one

human being to another, apparently being passed on from hand to hand,—of something, that is to say, at once visible and tangible,—and in particular, as 1 Chron. $28^{19}$ shows, material on which was engraved or written a plan, or perhaps merely (so Curtis[1]) a description *in words* of the shape and form of the building. The Chronicler characteristically modifies and transforms his source: we should gather from Kings that the Temple was built from plans supplied by and realizing the architectural ideas of a Tyrian architect: according to Chronicles it was built according to 'the build' written 'from the hand of Yahweh upon David', i.e., apparently, written down by David under inspiration and by him handed to Solomon. Once again there is no suggestion of an altar existing or of a sacrificial service carried on in heaven; the earthly temple is not implied to be a replica of a heavenly temple, but only to have been built according to the idea not of some human architect but of God.

A careful examination of what Ezekiel, P, and Chronicles say with regard to the heavenly origin of tabernacle and temple does not, therefore, appear to me to justify the conclusion which was drawn perhaps relatively early, possibly by the LXX, and is still drawn by some—e.g. Dr. Charles on Test. Levi, $3^5$ remarks:[2] 'A sacrificial service in heaven is suggested by the heavenly patterns spoken of in Ex. $25^{9, 40}$', but a sacrificial service in heaven could only be if the 'heavenly pattern' shown Moses, Ezekiel, and David were actual objects used in heaven for the same purpose for which the corresponding objects on earth were used: but so far are the O.T. references from suggesting this that they do not even locate the 'patterns' permanently in heaven—they are patterns made in heaven and handed over to men.

The two ideas last considered are not mutually exclusive; for obviously at one and the same time and by the same people it might be believed that there was a temple and altar in heaven,

[1] *Chronicles, ICC*, p. 299.]

[2] *Apoc.* and *Pseudepigrapha* (1913) summarizing the note in the *Comm.* In *Studies in the Apoc.* (1913) he withdraws this view and remarks, 'These references (Exod., Ezek., Chron.) taken in themselves do not postulate a belief in a heavenly temple', and he goes on to argue that the Jewish belief as a matter of fact originated later than Exodus and Ezekiel, if not also later than Chronicles.

nd that the temple and altar on earth were constructed from lans supplied from heaven; yet it seems improbable that P in articular would have been entirely silent as to sacrificial service heaven if he had believed in such a service, and believed in it s the original of the sacrificial service of the tabernacle and emple; for it would have been after his manner to point ut that, as the Sabbath rest on earth corresponded to God's abbath rest in heaven, so Israel's sacrificial service corre-ponded to the sacrificial service in heaven—a correspondence hich his successor, the author of the Book of Jubilees, does not il to observe. Thus there is not only an absence of any posi-ve evidence for the existence of a belief in a heavenly altar with regular sacrificial service associated with it, but there is at least certain presumption *against* the existence of this belief among he Jews in the age of P. let us say *c.* 500 B.C. The case would f course be different *if* the altar and temple seen by Isaiah in is inaugural vision were in heaven; but they were not: what as revealed to Isaiah in the vision was the Holy One of Israel erilously present on earth in the midst of the holy Israel.

The idea of a heavenly temple and a heavenly sacrificial service clear and prominent in the Apocalypse of John in its present orm, i.e. by the end of the first century A.D.: but it appears early if less prominently in apocalyptic literature which may be erhaps about two centuries earlier than this. If so, this Jewish elief appears most probably to have evolved between *c.* 500 and oo B.C. (Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse*, 166, between 300 nd 150).

The two earlier apocalyptic books with which we are now oncerned are: 1. The Testaments, and 2. The Book of Jubilees. oth are assigned by Dr. Charles to the close of the second entury B.C., and though the former work has received numerous hristian interpolations, the passage of present interest bears no ign of being one of these but is apparently part of the original ork.

The Testament of Levi contains an account of the seven heavens nto which Levi enters in vision. This account appears to have een expanded from an earlier form of the text which spoke nly of three heavens. In one of these heavens—apparently he sixth of the seven—are 'the archangels (v. l. angels of the

presence of the Lord) who minister (λειτουργοῦντες) and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous, offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and bloodless offering'.[1] A briefer form of the text reads simply 'And the hosts of the angels are ministering and praising the Lord'. Even the longer form of the text does not, it is true, mention the altar by name, but the sacrificial nature of the service which they perform is clear in the longer text and probably covered by the term λειτουργεῖν in the shorter, and we may therefore infer that the writer pictured to himself an altar in heaven which the angels served, making propitiation at it for the errors of the righteous. Later writers enter into fuller details with regard to the nature of the sacrifice offered by the angels and the details of their service, but before considering these it will be convenient to notice the implications of statements in the almost contemporary work—the Book of Jubilees.

According to Jubilees the Jewish law was part of the eternal purpose of God, and as such written on the heavenly tablets and communicated through angels to men. This general principle is reiterated in reference to several particular rituals, amongst others the ritual of the Feast of Weeks; but with regard to this (6) it is remarkably added that 'this whole festival was celebrated in heaven from the day of creation to the days of Noah, when Noah and his sons commenced to celebrate it on earth'; but this festival included—and the fact is specified immediately afterwards—sacrifices. We must infer then that sacrifices were offered in heaven during the period specified, though it is not said, but the reverse is rather suggested, that the sacrifices in particular of the Feast of Weeks continued to be offered in heaven after the purpose of God that they should be offered on earth had been achieved. The heavenly sacrificial service contemplated in Jubilees differs in another respect from that in the Testaments: in the Testaments the service is propitiatory; in Jubilees it is scarcely, and should certainly not be primarily, this; for in the special sacrifice appointed in the Law for Pentecost the propitiatory element plays a small part, especially as compared with the Day of Atonement.[2] But this fact, of different ideas of

[1] Test. Levi, $3^5$; Charles, p. 306.]
[2] Cp. Num. $28^{26-31}$ with $29^{7-11}$ [also Lev. 16].

ne particular forms of sacrifice offered at the heavenly altars, ppearing in almost contemporaneous writings at the close of ne second century B. C., together with the allusive way in which ne idea is introduced as something accepted not something ew, rather indicates that the idea itself, if as already indicated ter than *c.* 500 B. C., is earlier than say 125 B. C.

Thus an altar in heaven seems to be clearly implied though ot named in both Testaments and Jubilees—an altar, scarcely wo altars; and the altar invoked corresponds to the altar of urnt-offering, not to the golden altar or altar of incense in the arthly temple; for on the altar of burnt-offering were propitia- ory sacrifices such as Testaments contemplates offered, and the fferings at the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost referred to in ubilees. The earliest references to an altar of incense in heaven, hich are also the earliest clear evidence of any kind that this articular detail of the heavenly temple had been thought out nd expressed, are in the Apocalypse of St. John. But of this dea here we may certainly say, and with even more confidence, hat may be said of the idea of the heavenly altar in Jubilees and he Testaments, that it is not a novel idea of this particular writer, ut an already current idea adopted by him; and without going nto any questions of the relation of the Book of Revelation to ewish *literary* sources, we may safely conclude that these ideas re of Jewish origin and not a peculiar Christian development of more general Jewish idea: for (1) the development is a natural ewish development from the ideas already established as pre- iously prevalent among the Jews; and (2) the subsequent revalence of the idea amongst the Jews is attested by Jewish ources and is connected with peculiarly Jewish further develop- ents. At the same time the presence of the general and the articular idea in Revelation is of first importance for the history f the idea in Christian thought; for from the first, as later, his must have been one of the chief channels, and indeed the rimary channel, through which this originally Jewish idea asses on into Christian thought not merely as an element in the hristian conception of heaven, but affecting or at least forming mould for certain elements in Eucharistic doctrine.

It is an interesting and an important question how far the con- eptions of the heavenly temple, altar, and sacrificial service in

different parts of the book are homogeneous. The visions of the book include both heavenly and earthly scenes; and at certain points the question arises whether heavenly or earthly altar and service are referred to: such a phrase as 'the temple in heaven' is immediately decisive, but the corresponding phrase 'the altar in heaven' does not occur, and the altar intended, whether earthly or heavenly, can only be determined by the context. The first occurrence of the decisive phrase 'the temple in heaven' occurs in Rev. $11^{19}$; but already in $8^{1-3}$ the context is decisive unless we conjecturally rearrange the text; for we read, 'And when he opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven for about half an hour. Then I saw seven trumpets being given to the seven angels who stand before God. And another angel went and stood at the altar, &c.'

On the other hand, down to the eighth chapter no decisive phrase and no altogether unambiguous context occurs; and unless we are prepared to impose upon chs. 4–7 the same conceptions that unmistakably occur in the present text subsequently, there is some reason for seeing in these earlier chapters the conception not of a temple in heaven as there is a temple on earth, but of heaven itself as a temple, an easy development from one of the ideas we have already examined: if the earthly temple is a reproduction in miniature of heaven, as the abode of God, it is no great or difficult step to apply the terms used for God's earthly to his heavenly abode and to call, not some building within heaven, but heaven itself, the temple of God; indeed, in the application of the term Ê-kur to heaven in Babylonian we should have a close parallel to this. But while in this case there will be no temple in heaven, there may well be and will be other things corresponding to the equipments and appurtenances of the earthly temple, as these in the first instance, according to the cosmic interpretation of the temple, were designed or were interpreted as correspondences to things heavenly.

In this section of the Apocalypse—chs. 4–7—then, we may, and perhaps most naturally, understand the conception of heavenly temple, altar, and sacrificial service as follows: The seer beholds a door of heaven open ($4^1$), as he might see the door of the earthly temple open; he is invited to enter the door and immediately on passing through the door of heaven he catches

ight, not of any further temple-building within heaven, but of *throne* with God seated on it ($4^2$), just as he might, had he been dmitted to the inner chamber of the tabernacle or the first emple, have seen the ark, the earthly throne of God; in front of he throne he sees seven torches of fire burning, as in the earthly emple he would have seen the seven-branched candlestick; and lso 'as it were a sea of stars', as before the earthly temple he ight have seen the great laver which was termed a 'sea'. Once nly in this section ($7^{15}$) does the term 'temple' occur; still, in his one passage the scene is unquestionably laid in heaven: and et the question arises: is the term 'temple' here co-extensive ith heaven, or is it used of a temple within heaven? What we re told is that the seer beheld an innumerable company omposed of men of every nation on earth standing before he throne; and one of the heavenly company explains to im that these are the redeemed, adding: 'For this they are now efore the throne of God, and they serve Him day and night n His temple.' Now we must of course admit that it would e reasonable to conceive of a temple within heaven as of vast imensions and capable of accommodating many ministrants; but ne picture presented here is of virtually the whole population of eaven assembled before the throne and engaged in ministrations nat cease neither day nor night. For such an assembly, is limited building even of heavenly proportions likely to have een pictured by the seer? Or does he not rather mean: 'standng before the throne in heaven, which is itself as the abode of God one vast temple, they render him unceasing service'? With uch an idea the transition to what follows is easier: the Shekinah s limited to no temple within heaven, but extends throughout eaven, overshadowing the redeemed and securing them from sun nd heat wherever they go.

Altar and temple are not inseparable: with the conception of eaven itself, not something within heaven, being the heavenly emple, the conception of a heavenly altar is compatible though t is not necessarily associated with it; at the same time the exisence of an altar, if it can be proved to appear in this section of ne book, need not prove that it was attached to a temple within eaven as distinct from heaven itself. Now as to the altar in hs. 4–7 there are two points to consider, (1) After the opening of

the fifth seal the seer sees underneath the altar the souls of the martyrs ($6^{9}$). This altar is not directly defined—whether it stood on earth or in heaven ; and the context does not unambiguously define the scene : the seals are indeed opened in heaven, but the visions that follow the opening of the seals are not confined to heaven. The first four visions are of the heavenly riders starting out from heaven to carry out their commissions on earth ; but the sixth vision—that which immediately follows the vision of the altar—is entirely of earth and of sun and moon and stars as seen from earth. Is then the altar of the fifth vision located in heaven as are, primarily, the objects and events seen in the first four visions, or on earth like the objects and events of the sixth vision ? The vision itself is in many ways remarkable, but it must suffice here to recall that the retention of the souls under the altar is a variant of another idea, viz. that the souls of the righteous are retained in special chambers or treasuries, and that at least in the earlier references to these, so far from being located in heaven, they are located in Sheol (1En. $22^{1ff.}$; Apoc. Baruch $21^{23}$; 4 Ezr. $4^{41}$). It may further be noted that if chs. 4–7 are from the same hand as the writer who is careful to define the heavenly temple as ' the temple in heaven ' we might have expected him to say ' the altar in heaven ' had he intended it, since as it is it is ambiguous. Still, he is at this point in heaven ($4^{2}$): when he defines the temple as ' the temple in heaven ' he is on earth (see $10^{1, 4}$). On the other hand, the white robes given to the souls under the altar while they remain quiet till their number is completed can perhaps be best explained if the souls are conceived as being chambered in heaven rather than on earth. Yet interpreting chs. 4–7 by themselves the balance in favour of a heavenly altar is by no means marked, if it exist at all. And certainly the golden phials full of incense in the hands of the twenty-four elders is far from proving, as Dr. Charles would have it, that there was an altar of incense.

The second consideration in this connexion is that the section regards the Lamb as a sacrificial victim, now living but once slain, slain, as we must infer unless we adopt an *exclusive* astronomical interpretation, on earth but living in heaven. How the now living Lamb was recognized as slain is discussed by the Commentators ; but it would seem that to a writer who pictured to him-

elf an altar in heaven nothing could have been more natural than o represent the Lamb in his character of sacrificial victim as con- nected with, standing on or beside, the altar: this could have been lone with results less strange than the picture of the souls of the nartyrs under the earthly, still less strange than that of these nartyrs under the heavenly, altar. And the picture could have been as easily expressed in words as visualized: instead of 'I saw a Lamb as it had been slain standing before the throne', it would have been easy to write—had the picture been really seen—'I saw a Lamb as it had been slain standing on the altar before the throne'. That this obvious symbolism is not adopted and this clear picture not presented might be regarded as some slight ndication that this section of Revelation, or the source on which t rests, did not contemplate an altar in heaven. Be that as it may, in any case the sacrificial act to which the Lamb had been subject necessarily belongs (so far as this section is concerned not $13^8$)) to heaven just as little as the slaying of the martyrs. It formed and forms no part of any sacrificial service carried on in heaven. Of the nature of other sacrificial service contemplated here or elsewhere in the Apocalypse, its relation to a similar conception within the N.T. and in Jewish thought, I hope to treat in the next lecture.

# XI

## THE SACRIFICIAL SERVICE IN HEAVEN.

### ii

At the close of the last lecture I suggested that in and by themselves chs. 4–7 of the Apocalypse might imply a belief, native perhaps to a source of the book rather than to the book itself, that the heavenly temple was not some building *within* heaven, but heaven itself, and further that these same chapters do not unambiguously refer to an altar in heaven, though at the same time an altar may have been pictured as belonging to heaven regarded as a temple rather than to a temple within heaven. It is in the subsequent chapters of the book that the belief in a temple within heaven is expressed with all clearness: 'And the temple of God which is in heaven,[1] was opened, and the ark of the covenant in his temple was seen' ($11^{19}$); 'and another angel came out from the temple which is in heaven' ($14^{17}$); 'And the temple of the tabernacle of testimony in heaven was opened and the seven angels came out from the temple' ($15^{5f.}$). In other passages the temple is not defined by the clause 'which is in heaven'. So in $14^{15}$ (where rather curiously 'temple' undefined *before* v. 17, where it is defined), $15^{8}$ (immediately after $15^{5, 6}$), and $16^{1, 17}$; but in these passages identification with the temple defined as in heaven is clear, or in some other way the context shows that the temple in question is located in heaven. It may be admitted that a certain suspicion rests in some of these passages on the originality of the defining clause; it has sometimes the appearance of a glossator's addition; but the several passages taken together—both those in which the defining clause is added and those in which the context indicates a heavenly locality for the temple—indicate that, at least in the present form of the book, the belief in the heavenly temple has exercised an

[1] So defined now because the seer is on earth (cp. $16^{1, 4, 8}$), and has referred without definition to the temple on earth ($11^{1}$) previously.

extensive influence: it is not only a case of some subsequent scribe having remarked here and there: the temple here is the heavenly temple; but the several references imply a more or less elaborated belief. Even if therefore it were possible to accept such a view of the composition of the book as Spitta's[1] and with him to conclude that from the component parts of the book—Jewish and Christian alike—all allusion to the heavenly temple was absent, and that the introduction of this belief is due to the redactor, by that redactor at least (who would be answerable for the form of the book as we know it and would represent Christian thought at the close of the first century A.D.), the belief was well articulated and elaborately expressed.

The articulation of thought whether on the part of such a redactor, the author of the book, or of the sources in question in relation to the altar or altars in heaven is less clear and certain: and to this corresponds a greater divergence among modern interpreters as to how many and which passages refer to the altar in heaven. The ambiguity is partly due to the fact that the author, as already remarked, never defines the heavenly altar as such, but leaves the context alone to determine the locality of the altar of which from time to time he speaks.

In five passages it has been commonly supposed the heavenly altar is spoken of: the first of these contains the vision of the altar with the souls of the martyrs beneath, seen after the opening of the fifth seal; I discussed this in the last lecture, and merely recall here that this vision, whether of a heavenly or of an earthly altar, is conceived as seen by the seer while rapt up into heaven ($4^1$). Two of the remaining passages, however, occur after ch. 10, which appears to represent the seer as again on earth; and, in these therefore, whether the altar seen be heavenly or earthly, it is seen by one who is himself on earth. In $14^{18}$ moreover, the altar is referred to in a chapter opening with the vision of the Lamb in Zion, i.e. with a vision of earth, and representing the seer as hearing voices '*from* heaven' ($14^{2, 13}$), as though he himself were on earth. After one of these voices from heaven, the narrative continues: 'And I saw and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sitting like unto a man

[1] *Die Offenbarung des Johannes.*

having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud: send forth thy sickle and reap, for the time to reap has come, for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud cast his axe over (ἐπί, R.V. upon) the earth and the earth was reaped.' So far the narrative is ambiguous: the vision might be of a temple in heaven to which the seer, after hearing the voice from heaven, looks up, or of angels in the temple on Mount Zion. The verbs used are ambiguous: 'send (πέμψον) thy sickle', 'cast (ἔβαλεν) the sickle over' are certainly applicable to the action of working on or over the earth from an earthly starting-point; no such tell-tale verb as *send down* occurs. On the other hand, as soon as the narrative continues afresh it becomes, in its present form, unambiguous: 'And another angel came out from the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar and cried with a loud voice to him that had the sharp sickle,' &c. Both temple and altar must be in heaven if this phrase 'which is in heaven' is original; and may still be of course, till the ambiguity of the passage as a whole is cleared up, even if it is not: but this decisive phrase is not too safely to be used, for it is strange that it defines the temple not on the first but on the second reference to it. Provided the passage refers to an altar in heaven, it is mainly of importance as a case of speaking of *the* altar, not *an* altar, or one of two altars in heaven. To the significance or insignificance of this we will return. One other point: both of the temple and of the altar the same phrase is used, ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ: does this imply that the altar referred to is pictured as *within* the temple? In other words, as the altar of incense rather than that of burnt-offering?

The same use of the term 'the altar' occurs in $16^7$: 'And I heard the altar cry, Even so, Lord God almighty, true and just are thy sentences of doom.' This altar, in the intention of whoever is responsible for the final form of the passage, is in heaven, for chapter 15 begins: 'Then I saw another portent in heaven—seven angels with seven plagues', and the cry of the altar comes between the outpouring of plagues by the third and fourth angel; moreover, in $15^5$, the temple, to which we must regard

this altar as attached, is called the temple of the tabernacle of testimony in heaven.

The main ground for surmising that the present form of the passage was preceded by a form in which the earthly temple and altar were intended lies in $15^{8}$, which records that 'the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God', i. e. with the smoke of God's wrath, and that 'none could enter the temple till the seven plagues of the seven angels were over', i. e. till God's wrath was over and the temple again free from its manifestation.[1] It has been argued that this really fits only the earthly temple; and no doubt the comparison with 1 Kings $8^{10, 11}$ has force: here it is said of Solomon's Temple that 'it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the Holy Place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord'. The manifestation of the glory of God, an occasional phenomenon in the earthly, was presumably constant in the heavenly temple.

The two remaining references that have been taken to refer to the altar in heaven occur in the vision of the seven angels with the trumpets: both are closely connected and must be taken in the same sense. Here again, if the verse introducing the vision is original, the altar is certainly in heaven; for this verse reads: 'And when he opened the seventh seal, silence reigned in heaven for about half an hour',[2] and this must be taken as defining the scene of what follows. But it is better in the first instance to see what impression the vision of the seven trumpet blasts taken by itself gives. It opens: 'And I saw the seven angels, who stand before God, and seven trumpets were given to them. And another angel came and stood beside (ἐπί) the altar with a golden censer: and much incense was given to him that he might add it to the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which is before the throne. And the smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints went up out of the hand of the angel before God. And the angel took the censer, and filled it from the fire of the altar and cast it into (εἰς) the earth' ($8^{2-5}$). Then follow the blasts of the first five of the angels and the plagues which

[1] Spitta, p. 162. [2] Rev. $8^{1}$.]

they introduce: and then we read 'And the sixth angel blew: and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar before God, telling the sixth angel with the trumpet, Let loose the four angels,' &c. ($9^{13f.}$).

Now of this passage three interpretations, so far as our present point is concerned, have been put forward.

1. It is suggested that the vision is of the Temple in Jerusalem and of its two altars—that of burnt-offering and of incense.

2. That it is of the heavenly temple, possessing, like the earthly, two altars.

3. That it is of the heavenly temple, but of this pictured as possessing only a single altar.

Dr. Charles in his *Studies in the Apocalypse*, 161 ff., has recently advocated the third; but in spite of his arguments, it still appears to me by far the most improbable of the three. Dr. Charles's main arguments are (1) that elsewhere in Christian and Jewish literature alike no reference is to two altars in heaven, and (2) that in speaking of 'the altar' (not *an* altar) in heaven, the several writers imply that not more than one altar in heaven existed; (3) that the nature of the references imply that this one altar in heaven was the altar of incense; and therefore (4) that Rev. $8^{3-5}$, both when it speaks of 'the altar', as it does first, and when it speaks of the golden altar of incense, refers throughout to the altar of incense and recognizes no other.

Of these four points the first is, so far as I am aware, correct; i.e. no other passages definitely mention two altars in heaven, but the regular method of reference is 'the altar' in heaven. Dr. Charles cites in illustration of the prevailing method of reference in Christian literature Hermas, *Mand.* 10, $3^2$: 'The intercession of a sad man hath never power at any time to ascend to the altar of God', cp. *Sim.* 8, $2^5$: Irenaeus iv. $18^6$, 'Thus God wishes us also to offer gifts at the altar frequently without intermission, there is, therefore, the altar in heaven (for thither our prayers and oblations are directed),' &c.: Apoc. Paul 44, 'And I saw the four and twenty elders lying on their faces, and I saw the altar and the throne';[1] this altar is said to stand in the midst of the heavenly city (29),[2] a not very apt description of an

[1] Cp. M. R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 548.]

[2] Cp. ib., p. 541.]

ltar corresponding to the altar of incense which stands 'without he temple': a Gnostic work of the second century (in Clem. Alex. iii. 43), 'The soul lays down the body near the altar of incense near the ministering angels of the prayers that are offered'.

From Jewish sources Dr. Charles cites or refers to *Test. Levi*, iii. 6, where the altar is not named but belief in it may legitimately be inferred: *Abhoth d. R. Nathan*, A 26 (second century A. D.), where it is said that the souls of the righteous rest under the heavenly altar: T.B. *Hag.* 12 b, *Zeb.* 62[a], *Men.* 10 a. It will be useful to quote Hagigah 12 b a little more fully and with more comment than Dr. Charles does. Hagigah here cites as authority for what is said Resh Lakish, a Rabbi of the third century A. D. Resh Lakish said, 'There are seven heavens. Zebul (the fourth of these) is that in which is Jerusalem and the sanctuary (בית המקדש) and a built altar, and Michael the great prince standing and offering (מקריב) on it offering (קרבן): and Ma'on (the fifth heaven) is that in which are companies of ministering angels, who utter His song in the night and are silent in the day for the sake of the glory of Israel' (Ps. 42[9] [E.V.[8]]).

Now from the consistent absence, apart from Rev. 8[3-5] itself, of explicit reference to two altars in heaven, from the somewhat numerous allusions to the heavenly cultus, we might perhaps infer at least that a second altar in heaven was rarely visualized, and that Rev. 8[3-5], if it refers to two altars in heaven, is exceptional; but Dr. Charles's second point, to show that not even in Revelation are two heavenly altars referred to, is invalid; it does not necessarily follow from a writer's use of the term 'the altar' that he did not believe in the existence of two altars, or that he might not, had occasion required, have referred to them. All that we can say is that he may or may not have believed in two altars; for, doubtless as a result of the late period at which the altar of incense was introduced into the Jewish cultus, the term 'the altar' continued to be applied *without definition* to the altar of burnt-offering; and this current usage is adopted by the writer of the Apocalypse himself: in 11[1], for instance, no one questions that in the command 'Arise, measure the temple and the altar' the earthly temple and altar are referred to, although it is equally beyond question that the writer was aware that belonging to the earthly temple there were actually *two* altars. But obviously if

he could speak of 'the altar' in reference to the earthly temple though knowing that the temple had strictly two, he could do the same of the heavenly temple, and that more especially when so soon as he comes to speak of the second altar he uses a distinctive phrase—the altar of incense.

Dr. Charles's third point is interesting, though, his second breaking down, it loses cogency for his particular purpose. It may be admitted, I think, that most Christian writers were affected mainly by the association of the altar of incense in speaking of the altar in heaven; this is not so clear with the Jewish. I am quite at one with Dr. Charles when he remarks (p. 162) that 'it is quite unjustifiable to conclude that every characteristic part of the earthly temple has its prototype in the heavenly temple, as conceived in Apocalyptic'. But for this very reason, among others, he is on more questionable ground when he assumes that 'the conception of the heavenly temple that prevailed in Apocalyptic' was one and the same throughout; and consequently that, because in Rev. $8^{3}$ the prayers are offered on the golden altar of incense, therefore wherever prayers are mentioned in connexion with a heavenly altar the particular altar contemplated was the altar of incense. This would only follow if these beliefs were rigidly consistent throughout the whole range of Apocalyptic literature, and we have certainly no sufficient ground for maintaining that they were. And there are elements in Jewish thought, as we shall see immediately, that might have made for connecting prayers with the altar of burnt-offering.

But even if the arguments were more cogent to prove that the use of the term 'the altar' excludes the belief in two, and that as applied to heaven 'the altar' meant 'the altar of incense', they would break down over the passage in Rev. $8^{3-5}$ itself. For it is surely nothing but a *tour de force* to maintain that only one altar is spoken of there: and it is quite beside the mark for Dr. Charles to explain the almost unanimous conviction of interpreters that two altars are intended as due merely to the illegitimate argument that the heavenly temple must in all respects resemble the earthly. Two altars have been recognized here because two altars are clearly indicated, (1) by the use in this passage of the same two *different* terms which were used of the two earthly altars, viz. 'the altar' and 'the altar of incense',

) by two different ritual acts being attributed to the two fferent altars after the analogy of the earthly usage. As in the arthly temple the fire burnt on the altar, and coals were at need arried thence to the altar of burnt-incense; so here the incense burnt on the altar of burnt-incense, but the fire burns on the tar (undefined). The alternatives therefore that remain are: ther Rev. 8 refers to two altars in heaven, or to two altars on arth; and in the present form of the chapter only the first of ese is possible. We can to some extent explain why here nly the two altars in heaven are mentioned: it is the only assage also in which two different ritual acts proper to the two fferent altars in heaven are mentioned; here the incense ingled with the prayers of the saints naturally suggests the tar of burnt-incense, but the fire symbolizing God's unity equires the additional picture of the main altar standing before e temple, on which alone in the earthly temple a fire burned.

But if we pass from the altars to the cultus, then Dr. Charles ally re-admits what he has just taken away; for while he enies that there were two altars in heaven, he admits that e altar combines some of the characteristics of the altar of urnt-offering and of the altar of incense (p. 178). This weakens some degree the sharpness of the antithesis between the ne altar of burnt-offering with animal sacrifice during the ajor part of the existence of the earthly temple, and the altar f incense, by its very purpose wholly divorced from animal crifice, in heaven. But so far as we can follow the sorting-out f Jewish thought on the subject of the heavenly cultus, it may e taken as one indication of a diminishing appreciation of e virtues of animal sacrifice. On the earthly altar, so long as e Temple stood, the Jews sacrificed animals because the Law, e expression of the will of God, required it, but why the aw' required it was a question the Jews were content to dis-egard. But once the idea of a heavenly altar arose, that of the ultus at it also called for consideration; a very mechanical pplication of the formula 'As in heaven, so on earth: As on arth, so in heaven' might have led to the thought of heavenly nimals sacrificed on the heavenly altar. Certainly such a ought might seem impossible by its very extravagance: but s it more extravagant than that of God as the archetypal scribe

poring over the Book of the Law as he created the world? Something, then, beyond its extravagance perhaps prevented this application of the formula becoming general. In a blunted form it does, indeed, find expression, but in work composed later than the Christian era: in the חכם הרזים (113[3], cp. Michael Luken 31, n. 3, Schöttgen, i. 1220) it is said that before the Temple was destroyed, Michael the high priest offered after the manner of the sacrifices of Israel, and this pleased God; but after the destruction of the temple, God said to Michael: 'You shall no more offer to me the likeness of oxen or sheep or goats, but of the souls of the righteous and of children who have not yet sinned: these shall ascend as a sweet savour.' Another explanation was that Michael's sacrifice consisted of sheep offered כבשים של אש (Schöttgen, 1220, Luken, 48). Yet even in these later expressions of the general idea, this was only one form under which the heavenly cultus was conceived. Another late Midrash (Talmud Reubeni, Luken, 48) says that from the time that the earthly altar *was finished* or served: 'I will not that thou shouldst slay to me on the altar that is above sheep and oxen, but only the souls of the righteous,' &c.

The prevailing view with regard to the gifts offered on the heavenly altar was that they consisted of either (1) the souls of the righteous, or (2) of the prayers of men. In the Testament of Levi the offerings are described less definitely as a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable, i. e. a bloodless, offering—a description that would fit either altar, for the altar of burnt-offering was not limited to bloody offerings.[1] But already in the Apocalypse, as soon as $8^{3-5}$ came to refer to the heavenly altar, the belief that prayers are the offerings presented on the heavenly altar appears. Similarly, if the vision of the souls beneath the altar is a vision of the heavenly temple, we are near the conception expressed in later Jewish sayings already, that the souls of the righteous are offered on the heavenly altar.

Now of the souls of the righteous it is definitely said in some of these passages that they are the equivalent in the heavenly

[1] 'Minister and make propitiation for sins of ignorance', however, only suits strictly the altar of burnt-offering.

ltus of slain animals in the earthly—in other words, they turally suggest an altar of burnt-offering. On the other nd, of the prayers of the righteous it is said in Revelation that ey are offered on the altar of incense. But was this the exclusive ew? In this connexion it is interesting and perhaps significant recall that when with the fall of the Temple animal sacrifices came impossible, prayers[1] took the place of the great sacrificial casions; for the morning and evening offering on the altar of rnt-offering was substituted morning and evening prayers.

It will be obvious that, except in the late-attested and parently rarer idea of the heavenly sacrifice consisting of imals of fire, the heavenly *sacrifice* is less materially conceived an the temple and altar in heaven, and, at least where prayers rm the offering, the actual sacrifice is not, like temple and ar, visualized. It may be further remarked that neither souls r prayers appear to form a *propitiatory* offering such as the raseology of the Testament of Levi suggests. But in both ses, under the form of sacrifice what is suggested is mediation the part of heavenly beings—in Jewish thought pre-eminently ichael—in bringing the human soul, made righteous, to God. is the souls of the *righteous*, and of them—or sinless children alone, that are presented acceptably to God; it is the prayers the righteous that the angelic intermediary brings before od—and these as the heavenly or real equivalent of earthly crifice that had no intelligible *raison d'être*. It is in some easure a resetting of the older idea that the sacrifices of God e a broken and a crushed heart. While these ideas obtain, we have seen, alike in Jewish and Christian circles, they do not ld the field to the exclusion of others which perhaps show up ore clearly against them. The activity of Michael in particular as the officiant at the heavenly altar does not appear in e N.T., though angelic officiants unnamed appear clearly ough in the Apocalypse. But may we see in the ascription the close of the Epistle of Jude a reaction against it? It is od himself and no intermediary that places, not at the altar, t that for which after all the altar stood, before his own presence

[1] Cp. prayers = sacrifice in early Christian thought: Lightfoot on Clem. m. 44[8].

the souls of the righteous. The language may be, though it is not unambiguously, sacrificial; 'to stand you faultless' (*στῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀμώμους*)[1] is the exact idiom used in Lev. 14[10 f.] of standing the sacrificial lambs faultless; and 'before his glory' (*κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*)[1] is the exact equivalent of the constantly recurring clause in the sacrificial ritual 'before the Lord' (*ἔναντι Κυρίου*) in the earthly cultus. The material animal was stood before the immaterial and invisible Lord by being brought to his visible earthly altar; but what of an altar to stand the soul in heaven before God? Still the soul might be, and was, to some degree no doubt, materially conceived? But what place is there for a material visualized altar on which to present immaterial prayers before God?

It will be seen, then, that in the main, thought, in extending the idea of material counterparts in heaven to details of an earthly ritual, really broke down over the material of sacrifice. The heavenly altar and the heavenly sacrifice are in reality heterogeneous. It is not surprising, therefore, that the idea of the true offering being the righteous soul, and the object, if we may so put it, of the heavenly cultus being to present this to God, often avoided or broke loose from the encumbrance of a heavenly altar, and used freely another conception, which we examined in the last lecture, of the correspondence of earth and heaven. Examples of this we find in Philo, and, more completely than is sometimes recognized, I believe, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Both these writers alike refer to the 'heavenly pattern' of the earthly temple; neither conceives of a temple *in* heaven, nor apparently of an altar, though of a heavenly high priest Hebrews has much to say.

From the general character of Philo's thought we might safely have inferred that he would immaterialize the patterns shown to Moses in the mount; but he actually expresses himself on the point in a way which shows that he errs as much, as an interpreter, in this direction as others who have adduced from the passage the belief in a material temple have erred in the other. But this only serves to make the passage the more important for Philo's own thought. Moses, he says (*De Vita Mosis*, III. 3, *Mangey*, II. 146), saw 'with his mind the incorporeal ideas

[1] Jude 24.]

of the corporeal things that were to be brought to completion', i.e., I suppose, realized the architectural idea of the Divine Architect for the *earthly* temple, but without seeing anything corporeal in the form of pattern or model. There is no temple or altar in heaven, for, as Philo writes elsewhere (*De Monarchia* II. i.), the entire cosmos constitutes the highest and true sanctuary (ἱερόν) of God, having as its fane (νέω) the holiest part of the essence of existing things, to wit, heaven: the other (i.e. lower or earthly temple) is wrought with hand (χειρόκμητον). Similarly, the altar of the earthly temple has no pattern in heaven, nor even symbolizes aught in heaven: but 'the candlestick is the symbol of heaven, . . . the altar of incense the symbol of the things of earth' (*De Vita Mosis*, III. 10). The pure sacrifice with Philo is the righteous soul, but for its presentation he requires no heavenly priest: the true sacrificial victim (ἱερουγία) is nothing but the piety of the God-loving soul; and its gratitude is immortalized and, unwritten, is yet graven before God and co-eternal with sun and moon and entire universe.

It is possible that in Philo we have a tacit reaction against the material conceptions suggested by the idea of a material temple and altar in heaven, with heavenly ministrants reproducing some semblance of the earthly sacrificial service in heaven. In any case, with Philo the temple, altar, and cultus are corporeal signs of immaterial heavenly realities, and corporeal counterparts of them cannot be in turn located in heaven. Such reaction is even more probably to be detected in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author certainly makes use of the prevailing ideas of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly, for he speaks unmistakably of the heavenly Jerusalem, though, significantly enough, even here he is contrasting the heavenly realities as in being the immaterial with the material tangible things of earth.

For his own purposes, again, he makes much use of the idea, probably already current among the Jews, of Michael as the *merciful* high priest, of a heavenly High Priesthood; but immediately and naturally as this is associated, as it is in the case of Michael, with a heavenly altar, he never speaks of an altar; nor, in the sense in which the term is often understood, does he even speak of a heavenly sanctuary or temple; he

thinks like Philo of heaven itself as a holy place or temple, but he never pictures to himself, at least he never pictures for us, a holy building, a temple in heaven. The holy place (*τὰ ἅγια*) into which Christ, having come a high priest of the good things to come, enters once for all (Heb. $9^{11\,f.}$) is not a temple *in* heaven, but heaven itself, as the writer definitely explains a little later in the chapter (v. 24): 'For Christ entered not into a holy place (*ἅγια*) made with hands, an antetype of the true, but into heaven itself', i.e. the real type of the earthly temple is not a temple in heaven, but heaven itself. Thus the writer selects from the alternative ideas of his time that of heaven itself as the true temple, and he rejects together with the idea of a temple in heaven that of an altar in heaven, because together with material sacrifice material altars have place only on earth. He pictures his heavenly high priest as indeed an officiant (*λειτουργὸς*) in the true temple, i.e. in heaven, yet not like Michael standing beside the altar, but, as he repeatedly says, seated for all time on the throne at the right hand of God ($8^{1f.}$, $10^{12}$, $12^{2}$).

A single sacrifice this heavenly high priest offered once *on earth*; but he does not repeat it in heaven: he does not immolate himself on the heavenly altar. On the other hand, in heaven his priestly activity is twofold: he intercedes and he saves ($7^{25}$): i.e. without altar service, he performs the same services which the form of Jewish thought on these matters ill adapted to the idea of an altar in heaven which a particular development of the formula 'as in heaven so in earth' had created: the high priest of the Epistle to the Hebrews intercedes directly; the heavenly priest of Jewish thought by presenting the immaterial prayers of suppliants on the material heavenly altar; the high priest of the Epistle to the Hebrews saves directly, bringing the souls of men into the immediate presence of God; the Jewish pictorial alternative, harmlessly perhaps, but unnecessarily, introduces the altar on which Michael daily offers up the prayers of the righteous.

A complete history of the idea of correspondence between things earthly and heavenly in relation to temple, altar, and cultus it is impossible, for lack of material, to construct, and in these lectures it has been impossible to touch on all the ideas and

expressions in Jewish literature which have been affected by it directly or by way of reaction. But two broad lines should be evident: one which starts from the conviction that the things of earth, including temple, altar, and sacrifices, are the material counterparts of immaterial heavenly originals, and thus makes earth *correspond to* or symbolize heaven; and the other which transfers to heaven more or less exact counterparts of the material things of earth and so makes heaven reproduce earth. Broadly, the Epistle to the Hebrews represents in the earliest Christian literature the first of these lines, the Apocalypse the second. Both of these writings exercised great influence over at least the form of later Christian doctrine; the abolition—and not merely, as in Jewish thought, the suspension—of animal sacrifice is one of the points in which the Epistle to the Hebrews became normative of all Christian thought; on the other hand, the heavenly altar, which plays so conspicuous a part at all events in that form of the Apocalypse which the Church finally received, plays a prominent part at many periods, more especially in Eucharistic thought. And here we may perceive in Christian doctrine a certain parallelism to the double treatment which the heavenly altar and the sacrifices offered on it had received in Jewish thought. On the one hand, spiritual immaterial sacrifices are constantly associated with this heavenly altar and the altar is immaterialized to correspond with this view. As in Jewish so in Christian thought, it is in particular the prayers ascending to heaven that are treated as the sacrifices presented on this altar, and with these are associated at times other Christian activities. In Irenaeus, as already cited, it is our prayers that ascend towards the heavenly altar. On the other hand, in proportion as the material Eucharistic elements are regarded as the sacrifice offered on the Christian earthly altar, is the way opened up for a visualized and more materially conceived heavenly altar. And the need has been found for continuing such natural developments. So Bellarmine writes of the 'altar on high': 'this is not to be understood so stupidly as to make us think that in heaven any bodily or sensible altar has been built, and that the sacrament of the body of the Lord ought to be borne to it actually and bodily by the hands of angels: but that there is an altar, that is, a spiritual altar, in heaven . . . no one can deny without wishing

to deny the Scriptures' (Stowe, ii. 367). Into the various attempts to maintain along with the conception of a heavenly altar the immaterial, spiritual character of the heavenly service, it is impossible to enter here. But this allusion to it may be allowed to round off this survey of the influence of remote thought on the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly on Jewish and, in part through it, on Christian sacrificial theory.

# XII

# THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND FUNCTIONS

## i

### The Terms for the Cultic Persons

In continuation of lectures on sacrifice, I propose now to lecture on the Jewish priesthood. The association of the priesthood with sacrifice commonly, though perhaps incorrectly, regarded as at all times essential,[1] was, at any rate during a large part of Jewish history, intimate. It will be part of our aim to determine if it was essential, and if not, yet how far and in what respects it was intimate. But no thorough study of the Hebrew priesthood or any other can be limited to the priests as ministers of sacrifice; in particular there arises the question of the relation of the priesthood to two other great institutions of the Hebrews—prophecy and monarchy. The union of the priestly and monarchic offices in the same persons is a well-known fact of the later Maccabaean rulers; the status of priest and the exercise of prophecy were united in Jeremiah, the prophet who was of the priests of Anathoth, and Ezekiel, who was both prophet and priest. The union of all three offices of prophet and priest and king in a single person belongs—if strictly regarded—to the realm of idea or interpretation rather than of actual Jewish history.[2] But in the realm of interpretation the union of the three offices

[1] Cp., e.g., Philo, *De Vit. M.* ii. [iii.] 29, § 224 (Mangey, p. 167), on passover—all priests because they officiated at sacrifice.

[2] Though civil government, the high-priesthood, and prophecy were ascribed to John Hyrcanus (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. $10^7$; *B. J.* i. $2^3$); but the title of king was first assumed by his son Aristobulus (*Ant.* xiii. $11^1$; *B. J.* i. $3^1$). Cp. Hyrcanus' coins הכהן הגדול ראש חבר היהודים and Alexander's יהונתן

has played a large part, for the interpretation of the work of Christ as the fulfilment of these three offices has been conspicuous in Christian theology and has so reflected back a fuller religious interest in the three Jewish institutions, though, as an offset to this, it must perhaps be admitted that the Christian interpretation has here, as well as elsewhere, obscured at times the reading of earlier historical facts.

The union of priestly and prophetic or of priestly and monarchic functions in the same persons belongs, so far as the instances just alluded to are concerned, apart from that of Moses, to late or relatively late periods of Jewish history; by that time the priestly-prophetic functions had become sufficiently differentiated: it is a question to be considered whether in the earliest period this differentiation—at least as regards priestly and prophetic—was anything like so clear, and whether a certain inconsistency in representing the same person now as prophet, now as priest, is not the result of an incomplete differentiation of functions rather than—in these as distinguished from the later cases—of the union of offices. But with this reservation it may be said that priesthood has of the three offices the longest and most continuous history among the Jews. The Hebrew monarchy existed considerably less than half of the period from Moses to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; prophecy was intermittent, and there were periods at least when the community were conscious that prophets were no longer arising and speaking in their midst, but priests there were from the beginning to the end, and, if we care to put it paradoxically, before the beginning before, that is to say, various separate elements had coalesced under Moses into a nation—and after the end, for Jewish *Kohens* or priests exist to the present day.

המלך, *βασιλέως* Ἀλεξάνδρου. Cooke, *NSI* 353–5. If we are prepared to disregard the title of king, and even this some would find in Dt. 33[5], 'And he was king in Jeshurun' (Bennett in *D. B.* iii. 444), Moses would be a better example of one who combined or was conceived to have combined the three functions of civil head, priest, and prophet; and so as a matter of fact Philo does represent him, adding to the three the fourth function of the law-giver, *De Vita M.*, esp. ii. 1, § 24 (Mangey, p. 134 f.) and ii. [iii.] 39, § 292 (Mangey, p. 179) end.

This long history of the Jewish priesthood was one not merely of changing fortunes, but of changing functions and constitution. Ultimately the priests form the highest of those classes attached to the Temple and concerned with the maintenance of its ritual: in the last days of the Temple its personnel consisted of *Koh"nim*, 'priests', and Levites, with clearly differentiated functions. Without at present considering variations of function as we pass back in history, I pass to a consideration of these two terms as such with some references also to other terms for officiants in the cultus that emerge for a time in the course of history, in so far as these serve to bring out certain points of importance suggested by the use of the two primary terms.

Priesthood was, of course, as little peculiar in the ancient world, or among the Semitic peoples, in particular to the Hebrews, as was sacrifice; and the Hebrew term for 'priest', כֹּהֵן, is not peculiar to the Hebrew language; but there is an interesting and probably a most insignificant difference between the *range* in the Semitic languages of the fundamental Hebrew terms for 'sacrifice' and 'priest': the words זָבַח, זֶבַח, '(to) sacrifice' occur with this meaning in Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Ethiopic, Sabaean, Arabic, Assyrian; and, as the regular philological changes in the form of the word show, these are not loaned by one or several of these languages from others of them, but are original to them all, with the possible exception of Assyrian: *zibu* in Assyrian is but one, and that a relatively rare, term for 'sacrifice', and may have been loaned from Western Semitic.[1] Still, allowing for this possibility, the evidence points to the term for 'sacrifice' being native to the chief branches of the Semitic language stock received by them from the remote period before the languages branched off from that parent stock, and thus in turn points to the antiquity and perpetuity of the practice denoted by the terms.

The Hebrew term for 'priest', *Kohen*, also occurs widely, though not so widely as that for 'sacrifice'; but it occurs with some striking difference either of meaning or usage—indeed the only

[1] Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für Babylonischen Kultureinfluss*, p. 66.

other language in which it appears to have the same meaning and to be used in the same way as in Hebrew is Phoenician. It is not to be traced at all in Sabaean or the other dialects of South Arabia, nor in Assyria,[1] i. e. neither in the remote south nor east of the Semitic world. It occurs in Arabic, but with a marked difference of meaning: it is there used of the *seer* or *soothsayer*, of persons unconnected with the cultus. It occurs in several of the Aramaic languages or dialects, though not in all; in old Aramaic, of which the records are scanty, it is not found; on the other hand, *the idea is expressed by another term* כמר of which more hereafter; similarly כמר but not כהן is found in Palmyrene and Nabataean. In Aramaic literature כהן appears first in *Jewish* documents of the fifth century B. C.; in these it is used alongside of the term כמר but with clearly specialized meaning; priests of Yahweh or Jewish priests are כהניא, priests of other gods are כמריא, so (E 15) we read of Palṭo, priest (*kumar*) of the gods [Khnum and Sat]i,[2] and again (Sachau, 1. 5)[3] of the priests (כמרי) of the god Chnub; but the Jewish priests resident in Elephantine describe themselves as כהניא (1. 1)[4] and speak of the Jewish priests in Jerusalem as כהניא (1. 18),[5] of the high-priest there as כהנא רבא (1. 18).[5] Practically the same difference of usage is observed in later Jewish Aramaic literature; e. g. in the Targums Jewish legitimate priests or others, like Melchizedek, regarded as priests of the true God are כהניא, priests of other gods or Jewish priests of the high-places are כומריא. In Syriac כהן is limited to Jewish or other priests of the true gods, but not in all literature is it used even for this: thus in the O.T. (Peshiṭta) we frequently find the other term כמר[6] even for Jewish priests, and this is the regular usage in the N.T. in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where ܟܗܢܐ is used even of Christ (e. g. $2^{17}$, $5^{5}$). The conclusion which it seems to me reasonable to draw from these facts is that *in Aramaic* the original term for priest was כמר, that as such in Aramaic

[1] Hommel (*AHT* 17) indeed regards כהן as a direct loan word from Assyrian *mushkinu* (=**mushkahinu*); but this is a paradox that may be left to itself.

[2] Cowley, *APFC* $13^{18}$.] [3] *APFC* $30^{15}$.]

[4] *APFC* $30^{1}$.] [5] *APFC* $30^{18}$.]

[6] Christian Palestinian כמו. [Cp. Heb. $2^{17}$.]

translations it was therefore the natural translation of the Hebrew כהן, of the Greek ἱερεύς, however these terms were applied, but that in some translations and in some independent Aramaic literature the Hebrew כהן was taken over and Aramaized where the reference was exclusively to Jewish or later Christian priests; in other words, that כהן—in spite of the difference of vocalization *kâhin*, *kôhen*—was not native to Aramaic, but was a loan from Jewish usage. Thus of the four great divisions of the Semitic languages two—Assyrian and Aramaic—did not originally employ *kohen*. Did even Arabic do so? As we have already remarked, *kâhin* occurs in Arabic with the divergent sense of *seer*: it also, like the Aramaic, shows the characteristic long vowel *â* as contrasted with the specifically Hebrew long *ō*; and for these two reasons its originality in Arabic might seem fairly secured. The significance of the divergence of meaning must be reserved for later inquiry: meantime let it be said that while the many competent philologists, including Wellhausen,[1] treat *kâhin* as native to Arabic, the weighty judgement of Nöldeke is in favour of the Arabic *kâhin* and Ethiopic *kâhĕn*[2] being loan words. If this latter view be right, then we reach the interesting conclusion that *kohen* is primarily—so far as Semitic languages are concerned—specifically a Canaanite term; for whether we hold that in general the Hebrews adopted the language of Canaan or not, this term, which is as much at home in Phoenician as in Hebrew, is most naturally attributed to Canaan rather than to a pre-Canaanite stage of the history of the Hebrews.

The term כמרא, already discussed as the regular *Aramaic* term for priest, occurs also in *Hebrew*: but as *kahen* in Aramaic has a restricted use and a special sense, so has Chemarim—the form in which כמר is reproduced in R.V.—in Hebrew. Its use in particular is very restricted: it means priests serving other gods than Yahweh; but it is not always, nor even frequently, used even of these: Egyptian priests (Gen. $41^{45, 50}$ (E); $46^{20}$ (P.); $47^{26}$ (J)), Philistine priests (1 S. $6^{2}$), priests serving Dagon (1 S. $5^{5}$), Baal (2 Ki. $10^{19}$), Chemosh

[1] *RAH*, pp. 134 f.

[2] It has been suspected that Ethiopic preserves the term *khn* in the form ኅ·ሀ'ነ 'mystery': if so, with a well-marked difference of meaning.

(Jer. 48[7]), the Baalim and Asherim (2 Ch. 34[5]) are all termed *koh"nim*: only in three or perhaps four [1] passages of the O.T. are such priests termed *Ch"marin*. We might surmise that as *kohen* was a Hebrew loan word in Aramaic, so כמר was an Aramaic loan word in Hebrew [2]; an alternative is to regard it as native to Hebrew or Canaanite, as well as Aramaic. The term has also been identified by some with *kemiru*, a term that appears in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets,[3] though not in a connexion that necessarily or even very probably implies a priest.

The significance of the *usage*—I deliberately at present abstain from discussing the etymology and meaning—of the term so far discussed is by no means yet exhausted. Phoenician is closely allied to Hebrew and in the usage of *kohen* stands together with it in contrast to the other languages: yet in one important detail Phoenician presents a very significant difference; in Phoenician alongside of the masculine כהן stands the feminine כהנת. Feminines of terms of office only have two different meanings: they may either imply that the person so described is the wife of the occupant of the office designated by the term, or that the person in question is herself the office-bearer; such for example in Hebrew is the double usage of מלכה and נביאה: Esther the queen was simply wife of the Persian king; the Queen of Sheba, on the other hand, was, according to the intention of the Hebrew story, queen in her own right, in other words a sovereign. So Deborah and Huldah, the prophetesses, were women who exercised the prophetic gift, but Isaiah's wife was, presumably, a prophetess merely in the sense that she was wife of Isaiah the prophet. Fortunately the Phoenician כהנת [4] occurs in unambiguous contexts enough to show that the feminine had the fullest significance, and meant a female who filled the priestly office. This is true of the earliest occurrence

[1] Hos. 10[5]; Zeph. 1[4]; 2 Ki. 23[5], and perhaps Ho. 4[4] (emending כמרין or בכמר).

[2] Baudissin in *DB* iv. 67 b.

[3] i. 15, 33. The king of Egypt to Kallimasin, king of Kardenses: 'Why don't you send a *kemiru* who might give you trustworthy information about your sister's wealth, &c.?'

[4] *Eph.* i. p. 47, l. 45 = Cooke, *NSI* p. 152, i. 45 (Neo-punic: ? n. pr.); *RES* Nos. 502 (= *Eph.* ii. p. 173), 509 (*Eph.* ii. p. 176).

of כהנת in Phoenician: the passage occurs in the inscription of Eshmun'azar, king of Sidon (fifth or fourth century B.C.) (*al.* third century): Levi (*CIS* 3. 14 f.). Eshmun'azar speaks of his parents as Tabnites, king of the Sidonians, son of Eshmun-'azar and 'Am-ashtart, priestess of Ashtart, our lady, the queen, daughter of King Eshmun'azar, king of the Sidonians: here then 'Am-ashtart, the daughter of one king and wife of another, is *queen* in virtue of marriage, but *priestess*, not as wife of a priest, but in virtue of direct official relation to the goddess; she is not merely priestess, she is priestess of Ashtart. So in the Avignon inscription (discovered 1897) (*RES* No. 360, Lidz, *NSE* p. 429) זיבקת is described as daughter of 'Abdeshmun, wife of Ba'alhanno and priestess (הכהנת ל) of the Lady (i.e. Pasht). Similar to this last inscription are several discovered by Delattre from 1900 onwards in the Carthaginian cemeteries: thus Hathilat (חתלת), the priestess, is daughter of Magon wife of 'Aṭasmilk (עטשמלך—*RES* No. 501). Direct official relation to the deity is asserted of Bath 'Abdmelkart the priestess of our lady (*RES* No. 7 = Eph. i. p. 293).[1] Not only do we find the feminine of the simple כהן but of the compound רב כהנם[2] = *arch-priest* (*RES* No. 540), viz. רב כהנת[3] *arch*-priestess, or chief of the female priests; and, unless we may suspect a lapidary error in one case the arch-priestess is chief, not of priestesses, but of male priests: for Bathba'al, daughter of Himilkat ben Magon and wife of the Suffete Himilkat ben Bod-Ashtart, is described as not רב כהנת but רב כהנם.[4] With this Berger has compared the *Mater Sacrorum*, a term which occurs in many Latin inscriptions from Africa, and Clermont-Ganneau the *Matres Synagogarum* of the Jews (*RES*, loc. cit.). Interesting is the case of Ṣaphan-ba'al, daughter of 'Azruba'al who is at once the priestess (הכהנת), in virtue of her own office, and wife of Hanno the arch-priest (רב כהנם).[5]

Equally, if not more relatively frequent, is the Arabic term *kâhinat*;[6] but in these references, though the term is identical,

[1] Other references to כהנת (different peoples) in *RES* Nos. 502, 509, 553: הכהנת (= sacerdos), (= Eph. ii. p. 137).

[2] This masc. *RES* No. (538[1]), 553[3] f. [3] No. 540 (= Eph. ii. p. 179).

[4] *RES* No. 736 (= Eph. iii. p. 57). [5] *RES* No. 553 (= Eph. ii. p. 172).

[6] Wellhausen, *RAH* p. 130.

the meaning, as already observed, is different from the Hebrew: the Arabic *kāhinat* was a woman soothsayer, not a woman priest, a 'prophetess' rather than an official of the cult and in particular of the altar. We have, however, at least one record of an Arabic priestess in the latter sense recorded, though, as our source is Greek, we are unfortunately unable to determine the Arabic term applied to her. The record in question is a passage of Agatharchides (*c.* 130 B.C.) in which he describes Phoinikon[1] (= Elim of Exodus) in the Sinaitic peninsula on its western coast: 'There too', he relates, 'is an ancient altar of solid rock bearing an inscription in old unknown letters. This holy region is administered by a man and a woman who for the term of their life occupy the priesthood'[2] (*ἱεροσύνη*). A woman holding a similar cultic position may be referred to by the term כהנתא in one (Euting 223[a]) of the Sinaitic inscriptions (second to sixth century B.C.). And certainly on Arabian soil and at a much earlier date we find another feminine term for a cultic official in לואה of the Minaean inscriptions; and if this term be identical with the Hebrew term לוי Levite, we have a striking additional divergence from Hebrew: masculine and feminine כהן in Phoenician (and with difference of meaning in Arabic), masculine only in Hebrew: masculine and feminine of Levi in Minaean, masculine only in Hebrew.

As previously remarked, Assyrian does not use the term *kohen*; it has, however, a number of terms for cultic offices corresponding more or less closely to the persons denoted by *kohen* or *levi* in Hebrew as discharging duties corresponding more or less closely to those discharged by the Hebrew priests and Levites. It is customary, therefore, to speak of *priestesses* in the Assyrian and Babylonian cults. But here, in considering the parallelism or divergence of Hebrew practice, there is obviously need for careful discrimination. In the English and earlier edition of his work *On the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, Professor Jastrow writes (p. 659 f.): 'An interesting feature of the Babylonian priesthood is the position occupied by the woman. In the historical texts from the days of Khammurabi onward, the references to women attached to the service of the

[1] Cp. Diod. iii. 42.

[2] *KAT* 3. 519.

Temple are not infrequent. Gudea expressly mentions the "wailing women", and there is every reason to believe that the female wailers, like the male ones, belong to some priestly class. Again, examples of women as exorcisers, and as furnishing oracles, may be instanced in Babylonia as well as in Assyria, and we have also references to female musicians as late as the days of Ashurbanapal. A specially significant role was played by the priestesses in Ishtar's temple at Erech. . . . The Ishtar priestesses were known by the general term of *Ḳadishtu*—that is, the holy one—or *Ishtaritum*, "devoted to Ishtar", but from the various other names for the sacred harlot that we come across, it would appear that the priestesses were divided into various classes, precisely like the priests.' So elsewhere he remarks that 'the statements of Herodotus and other writers suffice to show that the three terms', Kizrêti, Ukhâti, and Kharimâti, applied to three classes of sacred prostitutes, 'represent classes of priestesses attached to the temple'. Now Jastrow is obviously using 'priest' and 'priestess' here in the wide sense of classes attached to the Temple,[1] in a wider sense that is to say than, as we shall see, ever attached to the Hebrew term *kohen*. In particular, the three classes of sacred prostitutes clearly enough correspond to a class of sacred persons covered by a different Hebrew term, viz. *ḳ$^e$deshoth*; and there is no evidence that the Hebrew term *kohen* ever comprehended either the *ḳ$^e$deshoth* or the corresponding male class of *ḳ$^e$deshim*. In other words, the Hebrew *ḳ$^e$deshoth* which correspond to the special class of Babylonian 'priestesses' were not a sub-class of priests, but *ḳ$^e$deshoth* and *koh$^a$nim* were mutually exclusive classes and terms. The sacred harlots were not, however, the only classes of women who performed services in the Babylonian temples. The following statement from Jastrow's German edition of his work may serve to define more clearly the extent to which women in Babylon shared the functions of male priests, and to bring out one difference of importance in comparing the Babylonian and Jewish priesthoods:[2] 'In general the transmission of oracles appears to have been a function which, at least in

[1] And indeed sharply distinguishes priest and priestess. The function of the priestess in religious history differs materially from that of the priest.

[2] ii. 156, 157: cp. the less precise statement in Rogers, p. 342.

certain centres, lay in the hands of a special class of Temple officials. And, if from the conjectural etymology of the special name *zakiku* for the oracle-priest a conclusion may be drawn, it is to be assumed that the god approached might in certain circumstances give his answer direct through his representative, i. e. without sacrifice (offered) or inspection of animal omens. Such a proceeding may be particularly assumed for the earlier period, and it is possible that at certain centres it was maintained to the latest—presumably at those centres where the oracle business was in the hands of women. . . . Women as oracle givers were connected with the service of Ishtar, and this service is to be referred to the cult of Ishtar at Erech. Down to the late Assyrian period this position of the priestess was maintained. In a collection of oracles from the time of Esarhaddon we find no less than six priestesses of Ishtar who delivered oracles to the king at various periods. In these cases the answer of the goddess will have been given direct, for there is no indication that women Temple officials ever participated in sacrifice and inspection of animal omens.'

Further discussion of the parallelism between the functions of Jewish and Babylonian cultic officials must be postponed: meantime we may pursue a little farther (for the scanty material available does not carry us very far) the examination into the place of women as officials in the Hebrew and Jewish Temple cults. For of women officiating and regularly employed about the Jewish Temple there is some evidence, and this must be considered in estimating the possibility of an earlier existence of women *priests*. But first negatively: we cannot infer that at any period the regular personnel of the Temple included female singers. The singers came to form a recognized class of Levites (Nowack, ii), but these were males; these references might, incautiously taken, suggest the existence also of female Temple singers; but these references are in reality irrelevant or altogether too uncertain to be conclusive. The 'singing men and singing women' of Ezr. $2^{65}$ and Neh. $7^{67}$ are certainly not Temple singers (cp. Ezr. $2^{41-70}$), but unless merely the product of textual corruption they were secular musicians.[1] Again, the 'maiden

[1] Another conclusion is drawn by Peritz ['Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult,' *JBL.*, 1898, pp. 114 ff.], who finds the simplest explanation of the

voices' to which certain Psalms are supposed to be set are due to ingenious rather than convincing guesses at the meaning of obscure Psalm titles, and afford no safeguard for inferring the official position of young women in the Temple choirs. Nor are the young women playing on timbrels—like Miriam and Jephthah's daughter of old—who are pictured in Psalm $68^{25\,ff.}$ accompanying male singers and musicians to the Temple necessarily or even probably Temple musicians: for in this triumphal procession[1] to the Temple, as the following verses show, the secular tribes of Benjamin, Judah, Zebulun, and Napthali participate. Of course women sang, and sang not only secular music: the songs in which they heralded or celebrated victory (Ex. $15^{20}$, Ju. $5^{1}$, $11^{34}$, 1 S. $18^{6}$, cp. Ps. $68^{12}$ (E.V.$^{11}$), Judith $15^{12\,f.}$) had often, if not always, a well-marked religious character; but these songs were sung, as the various references show, in the open, not in the Temple.

Jeremias (*ATAO*$^{3}$, p. 630 n.) discovers on an inscription of Sennacherib a statement 'hitherto unnoticed but very important for the history of pre-exilic Temple music in Jerusalem'. But on examination the passage in question is seen to contain no reference, even the remotest, to the Temple, and the assumption that musicians referred to are certainly (ib. 435) Temple musicians would only be justified if we could adopt the prior assumption that all singers in Israel were Temple singers. Sennacherib's words in describing Hezekiah's tribute are these: 'With thirty talents of gold (and) 800 talents of silver, precious stones, stibium, *uknû*-stones, couches of ivory, *ushu* and *uḫarinnu* wood, diverse objects, a heavy treasure, and his daughters, the women

passage in Ezr.–Neh. is 'the supposition that not only did women in early Hebrew history participate in religious song, but that they furnished such sacred music as was used in sacred worship, and that, even in this later time, women still held positions in the temple choir'. But whatever the difficulties of the passage may be, and they are real and considerable, we cannot, even to avoid the conclusion that seems to Professor Peritz so improbable, viz. that the 42,000 religious enthusiasts returning from Babylon to a desolate home should carry with them 245 secular musicians, admit with him that the writer sandwiches in 245 male and female members of the Temple choirs between the maidservants and the asses of the returning community.

[1] Cp. the procession described in Judith $15^{12\,f.}$

of his palace, male musicians, female musicians, he despatched after me to Nineveh.' (Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 344.)

There are but two terms in the O.T. that imply the regular service of women about the sanctuaries; the first is that already referred to, the קדשות, the term applied to the sacred women who officially practised prostitution at the sanctuaries in the service of the gods. The Hebrew laws sternly forbade the intrusion of this Canaanite custom into the service and Temple of Yahweh. This term is a term with a corresponding masculine. The remaining term used of women serving in or about the sanctuary occurs but twice—in Ex. $38^{8}$, 1 S. $2^{22\,b}$ (MT, not LXX). It is a feminine participle used substantively in Ex., adjectively (attached to נשים) in Sam.: the verb and the cognate noun are used in two passages (Nu. $8^{24}$, $4^{23}$) of the work of the Levites during their years of service (from twenty-five or thirty to fifty-one) about the tabernacle; but originally the verb meant to give military service, to war or to fight. We need not here inquire how this curious transition of meaning from war service to liturgical (LXX λειτουργεῖν) or Temple service took place; but the origin of the term may warn us against inferring that the use of the term of women implies that the women were female priests or Levites, qualified to perform service *limited* to priests or Levites. What kind of service these women rendered and under what conditions we cannot say, for the two references are to accidental not essential activities. In Ex. $38^{8}$ we are informed that these female servants about the door of the tabernacle gave their mirrors as an offering out of which the brass laver of the tabernacle was made. In Samuel these women appear only as those with whom the sons of Eli misconducted themselves. Though both references are to early periods in the history of Israel, they cannot be taken directly as evidence of conditions then prevailing, but of the conditions of the somewhat late post-exilic period to which the references belong: of course this does not preclude the possibility, nor perhaps the probability, that such women attendants were also associated with the Temple or sanctuaries in the earlier periods also; but the important point is this, that our only references to them are from a period when references to priests and Levites are abundant, and when the nature of those references are such as to render it impossible that these women

were female priests or Levites by profession: Levites by birth they may have been, but even of this there is no evidence nor any great presumption.

We have now examined those lines of evidence bearing on the place of women as officials in the Hebrew cult: the direct evidence of the Hebrew records, the philological, the comparative custom of Semitic peoples. What conclusions may we draw? Let me first cite the conclusion of Professor Peritz in his article on 'Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult', to which I have already referred. It is as follows (p. 114): 'The Semites in general, and the Hebrews in particular, and the latter especially in the earlier periods of their history, exhibit no tendency to discriminate between man and woman, so far as regards participation in religious practices, but woman participates in all the essentials of the cult, *both as worshipper and official*:[1] and only in later time, with the progress in the development of the cult itself, a tendency appears, not so much, however, to exclude woman from the cult, as rather to make man prominent in it.' Professor Peritz's essay, which is a legitimate protest against certain influential attempts to ignore or underestimate the rights of women in the cult and the participation of women in certain other religious activities, suffers in turn from an imperfect recognition of actual discrimination between men and women; and in particular because he fails to keep sufficiently distinct participation in the cult as worshipper and official, and the distinction—which, if not original, is certainly early—between prophet and priest. With his arguments that woman as *worshipper* has free access to the cult, and that women were prophets in the same sense and at the same time as men, we are not concerned, and now merely say that they are substantially sound; but the question is, Were women at any period in the history of Hebrew religion priests? For the later period of the religion—from the Exile onwards, and indeed from an even earlier period, we may with confidence assert that women were not admitted to the priestly office or to Levitical service. For this later period we have sufficient records for the bare argument from silence to be weighty, but it can be

[1] Italics mine.

reinforced, if need be, by such considerations as that the physical disabilities of priestly service are expressed in terms inapplicable to and irrelevant to women. But it is precisely at this period, as we have seen, that in the Phoenician records priestesses appear with frequency alongside of priests, women as well as men occupy the office of priest (and even of arch-priest) or *kohen*; at this period, then, we can establish an important difference in religious institutions between Israel and Phoenicia. For the earlier period, for which the records are so much scantier, the argument from silence becomes correspondingly less weighty; and, if we wish, passing beyond the facts that the language contains no feminine for 'priest' and that there is no record of any priestly act performed by women, we are driven to rely on inference and analogy, and either to assert or to deny that in early Israel women were priests. Some of the arguments from analogy on which Peritz relies in asserting or suggesting that there were female priests not merely break down, but, for what they are worth, turn in the other direction. He argues that in Semitic religion generally women priests are a natural corollary to female divinities; and we may add that when we can discover women priests they are—as in Phoenicia—especially given to the service of female divinities. But this call for women priests vanishes from the religion of Israel—from the distinctive religion of Israel, that is to say, apart from heathen cults to which some or many of the Hebrews were from time to time addicted; for the religion of Israel recognized no other god beside Yahweh, least of all any female deity with a right to be worshipped in Israel. The absence from the language of a feminine of *kohen* corresponds to the absence of a feminine for *El*, *Eloah*, or *Elohim*, though feminines of these too occur in the cognate languages. Again, in arguing from the analogy of Arabic heathenism, Peritz remarks (p. 116): 'Arabic heathenism has two chief cultic officials: *sâdin*, the temple watchman, and *ḥâjib* (door-keeper), the temple-servant or priest: and *kâhin*, the seer or prophet. In the latter class women are numerous; but of the woman *sâdin* there is not a single instance that I can find'. And now it is precisely this second negative fact which is much more significant for the question at issue than Peritz seems to realize: and it points away from the conclusion that Peritz seeks to establish. Female

seers or prophets in Israel there certainly were: we do not need, though it is interesting to have, the Arabic parallel to this fact. But were the Hebrew female seers closely associated with the cult? Or were the temple-keepers and the administrators of the cultus exclusively men as the Arabic *sadins* or *hajibs* appear to have been? That there were many Arabic female *kahins* is no proof that there were Hebrew female *kohens*; with the difference in function covered by the same terms in the two languages there may have gone difference in sex-limitation in practice. The question ultimately turns on the use which we wish to make of the term 'priest' in relation to early Israel and the differentiation between 'priest' and 'seer'. Without closing these other questions at present, I will merely state my own judgement on the question whether female priests were ever recognized in the Hebrew religion thus: in the later periods the priestly and Levitical classes were closed orders; at an earlier period the priestly class was, as is now at least commonly believed, open, not limited by particular descent; from the time at which the orders became closed, however early we place that development, women were not admitted to the priesthood, and though of course women reckoned their descent from Levi, they did not exercise the special cultic Levitical service. With regard to the period prior to the closing of the orders nothing further can be satisfactorily said at the present point, though I shall have the opportunity of briefly returning to the subject in subsequent lectures.

# XIII

## THE MOSAIC PRIESTHOOD.

> Moses and Aaron were among his priests,
> And Samuel among them that called upon his name:
> They called unto Yahweh, and he answered them.
> In the pillar of cloud he spake unto them. Ps. 99[6 f.]

MOSES the law-giver and Moses the prophet are familiar conceptions: Moses the priest much less so, and yet, in spite of some ambiguities of construction and meaning, these lines of Psalm 99 clearly appear to assert that Moses was a priest of Yahweh, and perhaps even, by mentioning him even in this connexion before Aaron, to imply that he was pre-eminent among the priests. But the passage is unique: nowhere else in the O.T.[1] is Moses *entitled* priest. Whether and to what extent without being entitled he is yet implied to have been a priest, in what his priestly character or functions consisted, and the significance of this for the history of the religion of Israel are the questions with which the present lecture is concerned.

The antiquity of Psalm 99 which entitles Moses 'priest' is uncertain: but we may most safely assign it to at least some part of the post-exilic period, and in any case to a period sufficiently remote from the age of Moses for its statements to have little value as testimony to the historical realities of the Mosaic age. It does not follow that, because this Psalm says so, Moses

[1] Outside the O.T. cp. very clearly Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, ii.) iii.) 39 § 292 (M. p. 179) τοιαύτη δὲ καὶ ἡ τελευτὴ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ νομοθέτου καὶ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προφήτου Μωϋσέως: iii. 1–22 is devoted to the priestly aspect of the life of Moses: yet the exposition really describes Moses less (if at all) as priest than as priest-maker. Moses receives instructions relative to the priestly dress, functions, &c., of *others* whom he is to initiate into the office of priest: of his own priestly activity Philo finds nothing to say. According to Manetho, cited by Jos. (*Cont. Ap.* i. 26), Moses = Osarsiph was a priest of Heliopolis in Egypt, to which statement Haupt (*ZDMG* 63. 522) is so far inclined to attach importance as to surmise that not Joseph but Moses was son-in-law of the priest of On.

was a priest; and the less that some other literature probably not much separated in time from Psalm 99 not merely does not entitle Moses 'priest', but appears definitely to exclude him from the Jewish priesthood. On the other hand the Psalm may be in harmony with *implications* of the oldest testimonies; but in and by itself it is evidence of the theory or interpretation of a later age, and over against it we may in the first instance place the differing theory of another work, viz. of P. Briefly stated, the theory of P on this point is that Moses was the human instrument in instituting the priesthood, but did not himself belong to the priesthood which he instituted: he was priest-maker rather than himself priest. The part played by Moses as priest-maker is recorded in Ex. 28 f., Lev. 8. After (Ex. 25–27) instructing Moses how to construct the sanctuary and the altar, and so to prepare the way for that sacrificial worship which according to the theory of P had not previously been practised in Israel, Yahweh proceeds in Ex. 28 f. to instruct him to consecrate priests—ministers of the altar and the sanctuary; these priests are to be Aaron and his sons now ($28^{1}$), and in future generations their descendants ($28^{43}$), *and these exclusively*; it is to be a mortal offence for any one but Aaron and his descendants to undertake or attempt to discharge priestly duties (Nu. $3^{10}$). After the construction of the tabernacle and altar (Ex. 35–40), Moses proceeds, as recorded in Lev. 8 and in accordance with the instructions in Ex. 28 f., to consecrate and install Aaron and his sons as priests; thenceforward, a legitimate altar having been erected and a legitimate priesthood established, sacrificial service becomes a constant observance of the community. Now if the priesthood is strictly limited to Aaron and his *descendants*, Moses the *brother* of Aaron is obviously excluded from it. Nor does P intend us to think of Moses as belonging, in virtue of being a Levite, to a priesthood which after being more comprehensive was *subsequently* limited to Aaron and his seed; for it is his theory that as there was no altar, so also there was no priesthood prior to the giving of the law at Sinai. And yet, remarkably enough, P does represent Moses as performing the first priestly functions on the newly-erected altar. With the installation and consecration of Aaron and his sons are associated certain sacrifices; and in the offering of these Aaron and his sons play the

part of the ordinary worshipper—for they are not yet priests—and Moses discharges for them the priestly function. Aaron and his sons bring, as any other ordinary Israelite was subsequently accustomed to do (Lev. $1^{3f.}$, $4^{4f.}$), to the entrance of the Tent-of-Meeting and lay their hands upon the victims that constitute their sin-offering and burnt-offering: but it is Moses who, as subsequently the priests (Lev. $4^{5-7}$), dips his finger in the blood of the sin-offering and then smears the horns of the altar, pouring away the rest of the blood at the base of the altar (Lev. $1^{5, 15}$), and then consumes the fat on the altar: it is Moses again who performs the altar ritual of the burnt-offerings (Lev. $8^{20ff.}$); it is Moses finally who obtains the priest's perquisite or strictly part of it, the other part being burnt in the altar fire[1] ($v.^{29}$). This consecration ceremony extends over seven days (Lev. $8^{35}$): on the eighth day for the first time Aaron undertakes the altar ritual (Lev. $9^{7ff.}$) alike for the offerings which he himself presents and for those presented by the people.

Thus in P, though Moses is never called 'priest', nor is thought of as priest either prior or subsequently to the ceremonies associated with the inauguration of the altar service and the consecration of the altar ministers, he does for one week (Ex. $29^{35f.}$; Lev. $8^{35f.}$) discharge the sacrificial duties of a priest. The Mosaic priesthood, if in such a connexion we may use the term, was according to P the priesthood of a week. That this curiously artificial arrangement is actual history will not readily be accepted on the evidence of P. But whence does P obtain the idea? It may be sufficient to suggest that in depicting the past he required a ritual corresponding to the present; and that as in the present priests were consecrated to the actual performance of the priestly ritual by sacrifices, so he conceived the consecration of the first priests for whose sacrifices, however, there was no Aaron or his seed to perform the priestly ritual, so that it became necessary to postulate an extraordinary and, so to speak, purely temporary priesthood. But it is possible that this particular way of meeting a difficulty of origins was suggested by tradition or earlier theory of Moses' priestly rank and function. One point, before passing on, may be insisted upon; P does not

[1] Perhaps secondary—Bertholet, *Leviticus*, *KHC* p. 26.

resort for the officiant at the consecration of the first sacrificial priests to a member of a lower order of sacred ministers: Moses, it is true, according to the theory of P was a Levite; but he is selected for the performance of priestly functions at the inauguration of the priesthood not as a Levite, for of this there is not the slightest indication, but purely on the ground of his own personal merit and distinction: the lower order of Levite was, according to P, constituted not before, but *after*, the priesthood (Nu. $3^{5ff., 18ff.}$).

From the theory of P other and, as is now commonly believed, earlier literature differs particularly in two points: (1) this earlier literature does not limit the priesthood in and after the time of Moses and Aaron and his seed; (2) some of this earliest literature does not bring down the *origin* of the Jewish priesthood to so late a period as that of Moses. The first of these points it will be irrelevant to our present discussion of the Mosaic priesthood to discuss fully. But both open up the possibility of a priesthood of Moses not merely for a week as in P, but even though not inherited and therefore assumed at a given period in his life, yet once assumed never given up; a priesthood once obtained held for life. The allusions to a Hebrew priesthood, or the existence of Hebrew priests, even in Hebrew narratives other than those of P of the pre-Mosaic period, are indeed singularly few: the only priests mentioned in Genesis are not Hebrews: they are Melchizedek (Gen. $14^{18}$) and Egyptian priests ($41^{45}$; $46^{20}$; $47^{22, 26}$). In the earlier chapters of Exodus the *Midianite* priest Jethro is mentioned (Ex. $2^{16}$, $3^{1}$, $18^{1}$), but it is only in Ex. 19, after the narrative has brought the Israelites to Sinai, but just before the giving of the law, that we find the first allusion in the O.T. to Hebrew priests[1]: Yahweh commands Moses to charge the people not to trespass on to the sacred mountain and 'let the priests also, which come near unto Yahweh, sanctify themselves, lest Yahweh break forth upon them' (Ex. $19^{22}$ and similarly v.$^{24}$). It has been reasonably inferred from this that this narrative—commonly assigned to J—'recognises priests

[1] In $19^{6}$ (J) the *idea* of priesthood is connected with the future of the Hebrew nation: but this passage does not necessarily imply that Hebrew priests already existed; this first follows from the subsequent reference in the same narrative (Ex. $19^{22}$; see above).

before the legislation of Sinai' (Dr.[1]); on the other hand the narrative of Ex. 32– also commonly assigned to J—appears to imply that a regular priesthood was first provided for Israel when the Levites, in return for their steadfastness when the rest of the people worshipped the golden calf, received the blessing of priesthood (Ex. $32^{29}$; so Dr.[2]). Whether these representations are to be harmonized or regarded as different views or theories may be postponed for the moment. With either a priesthood of Moses is compatible—from Sinai onwards on the one representation, even prior to Sinai on the other.

Before and as preparation for coming more fully and directly to Moses as priest, it will be useful to seize the fact that even after the narrative of Sinai the allusions to priests in early literature were not numerous nor varied; prior to the conquest of Canaan, all that these early narratives record of the priests is that they bore the ark—through Jordan (Jos. $3^{6}$) and with blowing of trumpets about the walls of Jericho (Jos. 6); and after the conquest but prior to the days of Saul our information is limited to the origin or history of two priestly canons or families—the priesthood of Dan (Jud. 17 f.), and the priesthood of Eli and his family (1 Sam. 1–4).

Moses, except in Psalm 99, is never in the O.T. termed 'priest'; but our earliest sources—though as we have just remarked these refer infrequently to the priesthood or to priests—at least directly and by means of the term כהן give Moses' priestly antecedents and record his priestly descendants; he appears as the son-in-law of the priest Jethro and as the ancestor of one of the two priestly lines which appear in the narratives of the early generations in Canaan: the priesthood of Dan remained in the family of Moses from the time of the Judges down to the captivity in the eighth century B.C. The fact that the early literature with its comparatively few and limited allusions to priests and the priesthood yet so clearly brought out Moses' intimate *connexion* with the priesthood is significant, as it outweighs the negative fact that Moses is not *termed* 'priest': it raises the question how clearly, how prominently in early tradition was Moses conceived as priest; was he a priest merely by accident, so to speak, because during his lifetime *all* Levites

[1 *Exodus, C. B.*, p. 174.] [2 *ib.* p. 355.]

became priests, and he was a Levite? or was he regarded as actively exercising priestly functions: and in that case what part of Moses' activities were regarded as priestly? And these questions with regard to the conception of Moses in the earliest literature lead us in turn to the ultimate historical questions: Was Moses in reality a priest? Whence was his priesthood derived? What meaning and significance have these things for the history of Israel's religion?

Moses' connexion alike upwards and downwards with *Koh"nim*, priests, does not necessarily prove that he himself was actually priest nor by itself perhaps that he was even by the authors of the narratives thought to be a priest. The daughters of priests were not compelled to marry within the priestly class even by later law (Lev. $22^{12}$), and Zipporah, daughter of the priest of Midian, in marrying Moses may have married outside the priestly class, just as in Genesis the daughter of the priest of On in marrying Joseph is certainly regarded as so doing. At a later date, when the priesthood was hereditary, the ancestor of priests was himself a priest; and the presumption is that the Danite priesthood in tracing back their genealogy to Moses also traced back to him their priesthood: the succession of priests in the *family* of Dan began with Moses, with Jonathan the grandson of Moses the succession of the priests of this family officiating for the tribe of Dan in particular. But these presumptions must now be brought into connexion with activities attributed to Moses in the early narratives: we may consider in particular his relation to sacrifice, to the reception of revelation, and to the imparting of Torah.

P, as we have seen, attributes quite clearly to Moses priestly sacrificial activity, though at the same time strictly limiting this activity to a single week: there is no such clear attribution of peculiarly priestly *sacrificial* activity to Moses in the earlier narratives; this may perhaps find its true explanation in the fact that there was no sacrificial activity that in the earliest periods was peculiar to priests; but without closing the question we may observe that in so far as Moses is brought into connexion with sacrifice, there is no indication that that connexion was, as in P, purely temporary. The most notable association of Moses with sacrifice in the early narratives is in connexion with the ratifica-

tion of the covenant at Sinai. The narrative (Ex. $24^{4-8}$)—attributed to E—records that 'Moses . . . built an altar under the mountain . . . and sent the young men of the children of Israel, and they offered up burnt-offerings and sacrificed, as peace-offerings to Yahweh, bullocks. And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basons: and half of the blood he tossed upon the altar. And Moses took (the other half of) the blood and tossed it upon the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh hath made with you upon all these conditions.' The occasion here described is unique: and so, in some respects, is the ritual. But certainly at a later time the blood ritual of sacrifice was a specifically priestly function: none but a priest could manipulate the blood, whether in applying it to the altar or to the worshipper. Moses, then, on this unique occasion himself personally performs what was in any case the most conspicuous and, according to later standards at least, the peculiarly priestly part of the sacrificial ritual. There is no indication that he might not have done the same on other unique or more ordinary occasions; or that some pre-eminence in the sacrificial occasion which was the ground for the Exodus [1] may not have been associated in the minds of those who composed or first listened to the story of the Exodus, though by themselves these stories do not at all necessarily imply peculiarly priestly activity of Moses in sacrifice.

But sacrificial activities, if certain of these were from the first a peculiar, were not the only peculiar functions of the priest. Priests were from the first, and most conspicuously in the earlier periods, recipients, organs of revelation. Not, however, even at first, still less later, the only recipients of revelation. Without attempting here very full discussion of the distinction between various types of revelation, and particularly the priestly and the prophetic, it may be sufficient for present purposes to recall that the priestly reception of revelation was closely associated with fixed places or methods—for example, with the tabernacle, or later the Temple, and with the ephod. From this standpoint we may consider how far Moses was conceived as priest: and on this point there are two things mainly to be said: (1) Moses' reception of revelation is closely associated with sacred places—

[1] Ex. $3^{18}$ (J), $3^{12}$ (E).

pre-eminently with the sacred tent: but (2) he is also definitely described as a unique organ of revelation: he is in set terms said to be more than a prophet, and we may infer that it would have been allowed that he was *a fortiori* as organ of revelation more than a priest. This description is at first, at least, simply to be set alongside of rather than harmonized with the application elsewhere to Moses of the title of prophet, and again elsewhere, of priestly modes of receiving revelation.

(1) The first revelation received by Moses was communicated to him on the holy ground [1] of Sinai or Horeb; and this ground was holy not temporarily, owing to an exceptional appearance or residence of Yahweh there for a time only, but permanently holy, sanctified by the permanent dwelling of Yahweh in the Bush (Dt. $33^{2}$, Ex. $3^{2ff.}$). Still Moses does not resort to the spot because or knowing that it is holy; for its sanctity needs to be revealed to him, and to him perhaps as the first to discover both it and its sanctity.[2] To this, as to other features of the story, the ingenious attempt of Nielsen to make the scene of the revelation a Minaean temple in the neighbourhood of El-Öla in Arabia fails to do justice: according to him Jethro was priest of this temple, his cattle therefore cattle for sacrifice, and therefore being driven by Moses as guardian of the Temple (Tempelhirt); the fire Moses sees is not that of a bush in the open, but arising from the altar of incense in the temple on which the fragrant thorn wood so slowly burnt that it seemed not to be consumed at all. Yet even if this interpretation, as improbable as it is ingenious, were correct, the narrative would still not necessarily be one of a *priestly* revelation; for even so there would be no indication that Moses resorted to the holy place *with a view to receiving a revelation*; on the other hand, this first revelation is clearly depicted as prophetic [3] rather than priestly, coming unawares to the recipient who was pursuing, like the prophet Amos, at the time his ordinary occupation, and, even if on ground already known to be holy, as unexpectant of the revelation as was Isaiah rapt in vision in the holy precincts of the Temple.

[1] Ex. $3^{5}$.

[2] So Gressmann, *Mose u. seine Zeit*, p. 30 f. against Dillmann-Ryssel.

[3] On its distinction from the prophetic (internal psychological, but real) as mythological (external, but mythological), see Gressmann, p. 21 f.

But it is different with another account of the mode by which Moses received his revelations. In Ex. $33^{7-11}$ we read:[1]
[7] Now Moses used (i. e. used every time the Israelites came to a fresh encampment) to take the Tent and to pitch it [*without the camp*] (afar off from the camp): [*and he called it the Tent of Meeting. And it came to pass that every one who sought Yahweh would go out to the Tent of Meeting which was without the camp.*] [8] And it came to pass that, whenever Moses went out to the Tent, all the people would rise up and stand every man at his tent door and look after Moses until he went into the Tent. [9] And whenever Moses entered into the Tent the pillar of cloud would come down and stand at the door of the Tent: and he (i. e. Yahweh) would speak with Moses. [[10] *And all the people would see the pillar of cloud standing at the door of the Tent and all the people would rise up and do obeisance, every man at his tent door. And Yahweh would speak unto Moses face to face as a man speaks to his friend*;] and he (i. e. Moses) would return to the camp, but his servant, Joshua the son of Nun, a young man, used not to depart from within the Tent.'

In contrast to the narrative of the bush, in which Yahweh on a single particular occasion reveals himself unsought to Moses, this narrative describes the regular method by which Moses constantly sought and obtained communication with Yahweh; that is to say, revelation is here conceived as conditioned by place and method; within the Tent Moses might at any time consult, and receive the answer of, God. So much is clear whether we regard the narrative as simple or composite; this, and for our present purpose the main, point is either expressed twice over in an original simple narrative or once in each of two sources now combined.

In the narrative, at least as it now stands, another point is sufficiently clear: to this Tent where Yahweh gave answers all the people who needed to consult him resorted: but when Moses entered the Tent, they remained without, and the implication would thus appear to be that Moses was the intermediary

[1] By most assigned as a whole to E (cp. Carpenter, ad loc., Gressmann, op. cit., p. 240 mainly): within square brackets E.

through whom Yahweh communicated when any ordinary Israelite sought his advice. But this is precisely one great function of the priest as an organ of revelation, as I may illustrate in more detail on another occasion.

Yet while on the one hand the narrative represents Moses as obtaining communications from God in a priestly manner, it at the same time emphasizes a uniqueness in the method of the divine communication to him: God would speak unto him as a man speaks to his friend.

This last point is elaborated in another narrative in which, however, the pre-eminence of Moses is described as pre-eminence among *prophets*:

> If there be a prophet among you,
> In visions do I make myself known to him,
> In dreams do I speak with him.
> Not so with my servant Moses. . . .
> Mouth to mouth do I speak with him,
> Plainly and not in riddles
> And the form of Yahweh doth he behold. Nu. $12^{6-8}$.

Tradition was familiar with the theme of the uniqueness of Moses' communication with God, and sometimes a narrative attempted to do justice to this by representing Moses as excelling all other priestly, sometimes as excelling all other prophetic recipients of revelation. There is nothing in itself improbable in the double presentation: as later on we certainly have examples of priesthood and prophecy combined in a single individual, so Moses may have been both priest and prophet. But there is one curious feature in the narrative of Nu. 12 which may be due to the fact that it rests on an earlier story in which the question at issue was pre-eminence in the *priesthood*. In Nu. 12 as now read not only is Moses, but also by implication Aaron and Miriam are prophets. For other references to the prophetic character of Aaron we can at best appeal to Ex. $7^1$ ('I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet'); for the rest Aaron is of course pre-eminently the priest. If Nu. 12 be, as Gressmann has at least ingeniously argued,[1] one of several narratives originally devoted to Moses' pre-eminence in the priesthood, it would possess the further interest of preserving,

[1] Gressmann, op. cit., 162 ff.

though obscurely, traces of an earlier female priesthood in Israel; for the question, Hath Yahweh indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not also spoken by us? implies that Aaron and Miriam belonged to the same class or institution as Moses, whether that were priestly or prophetic. But the priestly activity with which Miriam would be thus associated would be oracular, not sacrificial. But whatever be the case with a hypothetically earlier form of Nu. 12, it is certainly the priestly method of revelation that is again thought of in yet another narrative which also brings us to a third priestly function attributed to Moses, viz. that of imparting the instruction or rules of Yahweh to the people.

Whether or not in Ex. 33 the people were originally represented as seeking oracles through Moses turns on the originality of $33^{7b}$; but in any case this point comes out clearly enough in Ex. $18^{13-27}$—a narrative of the first importance in estimating the extent to which tradition, whether rightly or wrongly, conceived of Moses as a priest. This narrative, like that of Ex. $33^{7-11}$ and Nu. 12, is commonly attributed to E, though here again Gressmann attempts an analysis into two sources which, if adopted, gives for the main points of the story a double line of tradition.

The crucial words in this narrative are (1) those of Moses to Jethro[1]: 'When (כִּי E.V. Because) the people come unto me to inquire of God—i. e. to obtain an oracle from God through me—I judge between a man and his neighbour, and I make known to them the statutes of God—i. e. the permanent rules—and his directions'—applicable viz. to special circumstances such as those for which the oracle was sought; (2) the words of Jethro's advice to Moses: 'Be *thou* to this people in front of God, and bring *thou* the causes unto God. . . . And thou shalt look out capable men . . . and let them judge the people at all seasons, bringing every important cause to thee—i. e. for decision by God through Moses—but judging all the unimportant causes themselves;' with (3) the sequel: 'So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said.'

'The chapter', remarks Driver, 'is one of great historical

[1] Ex. $18^{15}$ f.

interest: it presents a picture of *Moses legislating*. Cases calling for a legal decision arise among the people: the contending parties come to Moses to have them settled: he adjudicates between them: and his decisions are termed "the statutes and directions (*tôrôth*) of God". It was the function of the priests in later times to give oral "direction" upon cases submitted to them on matters too of civil right (Dt. $17^{8-11}$) and of economical observance ($24^{8}$): and here Moses himself appears discharging the same function, and so creating the primitive nucleus of Hebrew law. He is not represented as giving the people a finished *code*, but as deciding upon cases as they arose: decisions given in this way, especially in difficult cases (Ex. $18^{26}$), would naturally form precedents for future use; an increasing body of civil and criminal law would thus gradually grow up, based upon a Mosaic nucleus, and perpetuating Mosaic principles, but originated by the decisions of later priests or judges.'[1]

In a word Moses here appears as legislator or law-giver; but, (and though this point is also really and rightly made by Driver, it deserves to be more sharply put) Moses here appears not as legislator *and* priest, or as legislator prior to legislating priests, but *as priest in legislative activity*; not as creating in the capacity of non-priestly legislator the primitive nucleus of future law to which man acting in a different, viz. a priestly, capacity and by different methods subsequently added: but as creating that nucleus of Hebrew law by the same method as that characteristically used by the later priests in amplifying the law, viz. the oracular consultation of God. Even in Philo, Moses the priest and Moses the law-giver are as sharply distinguished as Moses the king and Moses the prophet, and in many subsequent presentations Moses the priest has simply disappeared to give place to Moses the law-giver. Yet, as a matter of fact, in Exodus priesthood is attributed to Moses with legislative activity, not as something co-ordinate with or apart from his priesthood, but as subordinated to his priesthood as a part to the whole. Moses creates the nucleus of Hebrew law as the first of the Hebrew priests. So much, whether historical fact or not, was believed in certain circles in early Israel; and is seen to be expressed in this early narrative of Ex. 18 when correctly interpreted.

[1 Op. cit., p. 161.]

The case is different with the next question: the answer no longer lies on the surface of the existing narrative; it may lie not far below the surface; in other words, it may have been expressed in a form of the story which we can divine to have lain behind the existing story, which certainly contains features suggesting that it has passed through more changes than one of oral growth or literary modification before reaching its present form. It is well to emphasize the difference; the next question is, Whence was the priesthood of Moses derived? The answer that can be given may reasonably enough demand different degrees of assent or dissent; but any uncertainty in the answer to *this* question does not affect the fundamental point from which that question starts: viz. that the priesthood of Moses, whether or not a fact of actual history, is certainly a fact of Hebrew *tradition*.

The story of Ex. 18 rightly understood is a story of the origin of the Hebrew priesthood in one of its primary functions, and of the priestly activity of the first Hebrew priest, Moses. And the priestly activity of the first is of the same nature as that of subsequent priests. Now prophetic revelation comes unsought, varied in its manipulation in the different individual prophets; but priestly revelation that comes in response to seeking rests on a craft; and a craft is either discovered or learnt. In the story of the first Hebrew priest we might therefore expect to be told how he discovered or was taught his craft. In our present story, however, there is no clear answer to this question. For first of all there is not the slightest indication that Moses *discovered* or that *God* revealed[1] to him the method by which he and his priestly successors were to inquire of God and obtain decisions on cases too hard to be determined by use and wont, i. e. according to ancient conceptions, by the already established statutes of God. Nor does the present narrative clearly describe Moses as learning this method from a human teacher; it depicts Moses employing the method, without describing how he learnt it. And yet, very significantly, even the present narrative introduces to us not only the first Hebrew priest, but also a *teacher* of the first Hebrew priest, viz. his Midianite father-in-law. 'So Moses

[1] Cp. Nu. $11^{16 f.}$ where God does reveal to Moses how he is to achieve one of the two ends achieved in Ex. 18, viz. the division of labour by the devolution of what at first rested on Moses alone: cp. Gressmann, pp. 178 f.

hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said' (Ex. $18^{24}$). In the present narrative what Moses does in accordance with his father-in-law's advice is to devolve on to other non-priestly [1] judges the trial of all the simpler cases requiring no fresh oracular decision, reserving for himself the trial of those cases which required a fresh reference to God. So far the story is natural enough: Jethro, who has come on a family visit to Moses, sees his son-in-law threatened with collapse (v.$^{18}$) owing to attempting the impossible task of deciding as sole judge in Israel all the cases of law arising among the whole people, and recommends him to divide the task. But when we turn to the actual words of Jethro's advice, we find that in themselves at least, and most naturally taken, they recommend and trace not merely what henceforward the lay judges are to do, but also, and foremost, what Moses himself is to do and the priestly method by which he is to do it. For Jethro's words are these (vv.$^{19f.}$): 'Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel. . . . Be thou to the people in front of God, and bring thou the causes unto God (for decision), and teach them the statutes and the laws; . . . and thou shalt (also) look out from all the people capable men . . . and set (them) over them (i.e. the people) as rulers of thousands, &c.: and let them judge the people at all seasons: bringing every important case to thee and judging every unimportant case themselves.' Now in the present narrative what Jethro recommends Moses to do himself Jethro is said already to have watched Moses doing—viz referring (difficult) cases to God for decision (vv.$^{14f.}$). This is obviously unnatural, nor can it be legitimately avoided by explaining the first part of Jethro's advice to mean 'go on referring cases to God as you have been doing', for the crucial words are simply not in the text. Far more reasonable than this at least is to surmise that in an earlier form of the story Jethro was not described as watching Moses doing what he afterwards advises him to do; but that in *both* parts of his advice he suggests a fresh departure in Hebrew practice, viz. (1) that Moses should make use of the oracular method for the difficult cases which he reserves for his own consideration, and (2) that he should lighten his labour by

[1] 'Out of all the people' ($18^{21}$).

appointing other judges for the less important cases. If the narrative already rests on two literary sources, it is probable that one (Gressmann's J) at least gave the story in this earlier form; if not we may surmise earlier oral modifications of the story. If the surmise is correct, then Moses was not represented in the earliest tradition merely as the son-in-law of the priest of Midian, but also as his pupil *in the priestly method* or craft, and thus the Hebrew priesthood is affiliated to the Midianite. If such be the form of the tradition it is of a nature not easy to explain as a fiction, especially in view of the fact that later modifications of the story were made with the effect, as doubtless also with the intention, of obscuring this dependence in religious institutions of Israel on Midian.

There is a further feature in the narrative of Ex. 18 that should perhaps strengthen the inference that it rests on a tradition tracing back the origin of Jewish institutions to Midian. In this chapter Jethro appears not only as the adviser or teacher of Moses in judicial methods, but also as sacrificing. That Jethro should offer sacrifice would be nothing remarkable: but the circumstances of his sacrifice are noticeable; for he sacrifices not at home on the altar which he regularly served as a priest, but while away from home on a visit to Moses; Moses meets him and recounts to him Yahweh's mighty deeds on behalf of Israel, and Jethro praises Yahweh as the greatest of all gods, and then 'Jethro presented (ויקרב LXX, Syr.; ויקח M.T.) a burnt-offering and peace-offerings to God, and Aaron and all the elders of Israel came to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God.' That Moses as host should have sacrificed and furnished forth a sacrificial meal for his guest and his friends would have been normal; that Jethro the *guest* offers the sacrifice and provides the entertainment is extraordinary. Another curious feature in the notice of the sacrifice is that Moses is not mentioned as among the participants. Have we here a much modified form of a story in which Jethro comes to Moses to initiate him into the mode of sacrificing to Yahweh? In that case the entire narrative would present Jethro the Midianite priest as the teacher of Moses the first Hebrew priest in two chief priestly functions—the sacrificial and the oracular.

I have attempted to indicate in the course of the discussion the

differing degrees of probability attaching to the various points made; some are extremely speculative. In conclusion, I gather together the chief points which justify us in speaking of a Mosaic priesthood. We should take our start with the most assured fact that the priesthood at Dan traced back its origin to Moses. The notice is later than 722 B. C., but can scarcely be very much later, and the statement cannot be explained as a later invention, for later times disliked the fact and endeavoured to conceal it by altering Moses into Manasseh! Down to 722 B. C. then there was at Dan a priesthood that was Mosaic in the sense that it traced its origin to Moses. It is possible, though I have not been able to discuss this in the present lecture, that another line of priests, viz. the house of Eli at Shiloh, also traced their descent from Moses. The claim of priestly houses to descent from Moses would be best, if not necessarily, explained if Moses was himself and was believed to have been a priest. And of this belief there is really considerable independent evidence. Once only in the O.T. is Moses termed a priest, and that in probably a quite late passage; but priestly *functions* are attributed to him, not only the sacrificial function now so commonly associated with the thought of priesthood, but also the inspirational or revelational function, particularly in connexion with judicial activity, which in early Hebrew life was not less characteristic of the priesthood. Thus the priesthood of Moses is at least a conception embodied in Hebrew tradition and early tradition. Is the tradition true to history? Was Moses an historical individual? Was he a priest? These are questions that cannot be fully answered in connexion with the limited scope of our present inquiry; but a word or two may be said. Eduard Meyer, who has done so much to vindicate the priestly character of Moses in tradition, commits himself to the assertion that 'The Moses whom we know was ancestor of the Priests of Kadesh and so a figure connected with the cultus in the genealogical legend, (but) not an historical personality'. Our extant narratives of Moses were written some centuries after Moses lived; but they incorporate legends and stories that must have taken form much nearer to his time. Now if these legends only referred to Moses as ancestor of priestly houses at Kadesh, at Shiloh, at Dan, they might be explained as priestly claims to a distinguished ancestry

having no justification in history, either because Moses had no historical reality as an individual or if historical no priestly character. But if we are right in detecting behind the narrative of Ex. 18 a tradition of a Midianite priest instructing Moses and initiating him into the priesthood, we have to deal with a legend at once very ancient and very difficult to explain as a fiction; in other words, we have about the best evidence that is available in regard to events of which no contemporary or nearly contemporary evidence survives.

Moses, at least as pictured in early Hebrew tradition, was a priest: later representations depict him rather as law-giver, yet this is less a contradiction than a partial continuation of the earlier presentation; or as prophet, which again is not incompatible with the priesthood. There is one point in which all three presentations meet: Moses was an organ of revelation; and among such various organs of revelation as Hebrew religious theory admitted, Moses was to Hebrew tradition unique.

# XIV

## THE EARLY PRIESTHOOD: ITS NUMBERS AND FUNCTIONS

THERE is one difference in the history of the Jews between the period before and the period after the Babylonian Exile that has always been recognized, and which a criticism that has affected so much in the traditional way of regarding things recognizes no less than tradition. Before the Exile the Jewish State was a monarchy; after the Exile a hierocracy: before, a king reigned; afterwards, priests; for even when under the later Maccabeans the royal title was revived, it now attached to priests; the new monarchy, unlike the old, was a priestly monarchy. Except through this combination of offices and titles, there was of course under the later hierocracy no room for a king: on the other hand, under the monarchy there had at all times been priests.

Our present purpose is to consider the influence of the priesthood under the monarchy: how numerous were the priests? what were their functions? how were these discharged? what were these, if we may so term them, extra-official activities?

It may at once be said that some of these questions are far more readily raised than answered, and that for precise and complete answers the data simply do not exist. Yet it is important to determine, if not the extent of our knowledge, the depth of our ignorance, that what knowledge is possible may be the more clearly and vividly apprehended.

The difficulty attaching to most questions of Jewish history is perhaps at its greatest in relation to the priesthood. So much that relates to the earlier periods was first written in the later, centuries after the events. The Priestly Code, the latest of the chief documents in the Hexateuch, has by far the fullest information about the priesthood: the books of Chronicles

are far richer in records of the priesthood under the monarchy than are the earlier books of Kings. The consequence is that nowhere more than in relation to the priesthood do modern critics differ from the earlier traditional conception of the history. If these late records could be taken purely and simply as a statement of contemporary conditions referred erroneously to an earlier period of history, the way would be simple: what the Priestly Code records would then be immediately available for the fifth century B.C., and altogether negligible for the age of Moses, and similarly with regard to Chronicles, which should depict the conditions of the third century B.C., but not at all those of the period of the monarchy. But the case is not really quite so simple: there is always the possibility of some admixture of things ancient with things modern in those late records; there is also the possibility that some details are purely imaginative, and correspond neither to actual conditions of the older period described nor to those of the later period in which the author lived, but express only cherished hopes and ideals not destined to be fulfilled. Not only is our information regarding the earlier priesthood most fully supplied by the later Jewish literature, but external, non-Jewish evidence on the subject is almost entirely lacking. The monuments have complemented and corrected the biblical records of Assyrian campaigns, but the monuments do not speak of the Jewish priesthood. What light is cast from this direction is mainly by way of analogy, and on questions of origins with which we have been previously engaged: on the number and functions of the priesthood under the monarchy it has nothing to say.

With this brief indication of the difficulties besetting our present line of inquiry, and the limitations set by them on what it can lead to, I pass to the first question: What were the numbers of the priesthood under the monarchy? What proportion of the population consisted of priests? If it is impossible, and it is, to determine with any precision the actual numbers, is it possible to estimate the ratio?

It is no more possible to fix with precision the numbers of the whole than of the priestly classes of the Hebrews: yet within such limits as the numbers of the whole can be fixed, it is important to have them before us.

According to a figure given or implied more than once in the Pentateuch, the total number of Hebrews who marched out of Egypt at the Exodus and subsequently settled in Canaan was two million. The impossibility of this figure for the period of the Wilderness has long been recognized: but it is excessive even for the population of Canaan. It is improbable that Canaan was at any time more densely populated than Scotland or Denmark: and in that case the population never exceeded a million. Again, if we consider the two Hebrew kingdoms separately, we shall not be far wrong in assuming that the population of Judah in its most prosperous period was about a quarter of a million, and we may safely say that 350,000 would be well beyond the mark for any period. Of the towns it may suffice to refer to Jerusalem: Meyer probably under-estimates the size of the city at many periods in suggesting the figures 20,000: it may at times, perhaps, have reached twice or thrice that number: during the Exile it fell to a mere handful, even though it may be rhetoric to say that no man dwelt there. For some period after the return it may have failed to reach 20,000.[1]

Our question, then, is what was the ratio of the priests to the laymen in this population of something under rather than over a million for the whole country or of a quarter of a million for Judah?

From as early as the ninth century at least (Dt. 33) the priestly class of Levi ranked as one of the twelve tribes of Israel. Obviously it does not follow from this that the priests formed a one-twelfth part of the entire population; for the secular tribes must have differed much in numbers, as in the area of country occupied by them, and there is nothing to show whether the author of the poem looked upon Levi as a tribe of average size, or greater or smaller. It is otherwise when we turn to the figures given by P in Nu. i–iv;[2] according to these it would be natural to conclude that Levi was a tribe of more than average size, and formed more than one-twelfth of the whole number of the Hebrews; for the number of male Levites was practically equal (22,000 as against 22,273) to that of the male firstborn of all the remaining tribes; i.e. the ratio of the Levites to the

[1] Guthe, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 236 f.; Meyer, *Enste.* 185.

[2] *Numbers*, p. v.

whole is the ratio of one to the average size of a Hebrew family; and since the *average* size of the family can hardly be placed as high as a dozen, the Levites, if we could trust these figures, would at the period to which the figures refer, have numbered more than one-twelfth of the whole population. It is true that this same set of figures suggests that the average number of children in a Hebrew family was fifty; but on this basis no one is likely to wish to argue that the Levites numbered only one-fiftieth of the population. The truth is, as is now generally recognized, the numbers of the census, as given in the Book of Numbers, are impossible, and cannot for our present purpose be treated as real: they cannot be accepted as giving either the actual numbers of the priests or of the ratio of the priestly to the non-priestly population, whether in the Mosaic or any other period. The figures of Chronicles are at least as far from reality as those of P, but possibly the writer thought of Levi as about one-twelfth of the whole of Israel: according to 1 Chr. $23^{4f.}$, male Levites of thirty years old and upwards were 38,000; the warriors who came to make David king in Hebron (1 Chr. $12^{24-41}$ (E.V. $^{23-40}$)) numbered 339,000, but in this number the warriors of Issachar are not included, and those from Judah, Simeon, Levi, and Benjamin are curiously few (Curtis, *Chronicles*, *ICC*, p. 202).

There is another set of numbers which cannot at all events so confidently be dismissed: these are the numbers of the Jews who returned from Exile given in Ezr. 2 and Neh. 7. From these, if they may be accepted, some inference as to numbers and ratio before the Exile may be made, though the conclusion drawn must be elastic and far from precise. Unfortunately, as is often the case with numbers in the O.T., though the numbers to which we now turn are not impossible, they are in some respects uncertain owing to variations in the textual tradition. The chief facts are these: the total of those who returned is the same in all three texts—Ezr. 2, Neh. 7, 1 Esd. 5; and this total is 42,360. But in all three texts the sum of the details falls far short of this total, and differs to the extent of about 150 in the three texts: the sum of these details is approximately 30,000.[1] Among these details is the number of the priests; this

[1] Neh. 31,089; Ezr. 29,818; Esd. 30,143; with variants.

is given as 4,289 (Neh. and Ezr.) and in some MSS. of 1 Esd. as 2,388: the Levites number 74, the singers and porters *c.* 270. This gives a ratio of about 1 in 10 of the sacred classes to the total 42,360, or of abo t 1 in 7 of the total of the details, unless we adopt the less likely reading of 1 Esdras, when the proportions seem to be about 1 in 16 and 1 in 12 respectively. Now if we attempt an inference, even an elastic one, from these figures, we have to allow for these considerations: a considerable number of exiles remained behind in exile, including some priests and, probably, a much larger proportion of Levites; a large number of Jews remained in Palestine throughout the Exile; of these Jews who did not go into exile few probably or none were priests, in the later restricted sense, but a considerable number may have been poor Levites of the countryside. Of those who returned in comparison with those who remained in Babylon the priests probably represented an exceptionally large proportion, the restoration of the Temple and cultus being a chief end of the returning exiles: on the other hand, the Levites who were eager to return were probably, as a century later under Ezra, a small proportion only of those in exile. These considerations may suffice to show how far from exact any conclusions we may attempt to draw may be; but it may be suggested that the proportion of priests and Levites to the total number of those who returned is likely to have exceeded, and perhaps considerably, the proportion of these to the three great representative bodies of descendants of the Jews resident in Palestine before the Exile, viz., those who remained throughout in Palestine, those who remained behind in Babylon, and those who returned. Our inference, very tentative and very elastic, will be then as follows: in Judah before the Exile it is unlikely that the priestly population exceeded one-twelfth of the whole, more probably it was considerably less than one-twelfth. If now we interpret these ratios in numbers, we may say that out of a total population of 250,000 it is unlikely that the priests and their families exceeded 20,000; if the ratio, as is quite probable, did not exceed one-twentieth, the priestly population did not exceed 12,000. Out of a total of 20,000 about 4,000, out of a total of 12,000 about 2,500, would have been priests actually officiating or qualified by age to officiate.

But even if in the century before the Exile the ratio of priestly to lay population may have risen so high, it is likely that at earlier periods it was lower. From the facts to which I now draw attention nothing exact or certain follows, but they may serve to illustrate the place and distribution of priests in earlier Israel.

In the earliest period we have two rather conflicting representations: according to one, Moses for a period is sole priest in Israel; but, according to the other, within the lifetime of Moses one whole tribe—that of Levi—was converted into priests. When we pass to the period of the Judges we find a narrative with a double point: in Judges 17 f. we read of an out-of-work Levite wandering through the country in search of a place: this he finds with one Micah who had built a shrine which he had hitherto placed under the guardianship of his son, whom he had made priest for the purpose. So far the narrative throws an interesting light on the fluctuation of supply and demand for skilled Levitical priests: presumably Micah would in the first instance have instituted a Levite as a priest if the supply had been forthcoming; on the other hand, farther south (for thence Micah's Levite came) supply exceeded demand and caused the Levite's migration. But what was the nature of the demand the country over? Micah wanted a Levite for his own private chapel: if every household needed a priest, the ratio of priests must indeed have been high: but the narrative suggests that Micah's case is exceptional, and he himself had been long married and his family had grown up before he built his chapel or needed a priest. The continuation of the narrative clearly enough provides a further corrective, and should prevent us placing the ratio of priests at this period very high. The tribe of Dan, on the move from its first home in the south, pass by Micah's house and seduce the Levite into leaving his present employer with an offer of making him priest to the tribe; the Levite accordingly becomes priest of the tribe in their new settlement at Laish, and his sons succeed him for many generations. The Danites numbered 600 men of war, or say 3,000 men, women, and children: yet this company seems to be without its priest at first and quite content with the prospect of one when they had secured Micah's Levite. That this Levite remained the only

priest—one priest to 600 lay families—in their new territory of Dan we need not infer: for there may have been wealthy laymen in the tribe, who, like Micah, had chapels and priests of their own; but the whole impression conveyed by the narrative is certainly that priests at this period form far less than a twelfth or even a twentieth of the population which certain considerations might indicate as the ratio in Judah in the seventh century.

There is one other method of considering the subject: in early Israel, and indeed down to the Exile, priests and Levites were widely distributed over the whole country and at the same time in certain centres massed together in larger numbers. As to wide distribution we may say that as a general rule where there was a permanent altar, or shrine, there there was a priest. Such is the suggestion[1] of the phrase 'priests of the high places' (כהני (ה)במות—1 Ki. $13^{33}$; 2 Ki. $17^{32}$; $23^{8f.,\ 20}$), or of Ezekiel's description of those whom he judges to be wayward priests as those 'who had ministered unto the people before their idols' (Ezek. $44^{12}$, cp. v.$^{10}$). Such altars or shrines stood as a rule at least in all towns and villages: 'according to the number of thy cities—a term that includes even small places—is the number of thy gods' is Jeremiah's charge,[2] and from his point of view difference of altar meant difference of god. So also the general rule one priest at least per township naturally explains the locution in Dt. $18^{6}$, 'if a Levite come from any of thy gates'. The larger of these towns may have had several altars with priests in charge; though he speaks rhetorically, Jeremiah no doubt is true enough as to the general fact when he says that 'according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem have ye set up altars to the shameful thing'.[3] Of the number of the townships of Palestine and of the streets of the larger towns there is of course no definite information: in part precisely and in part rhetorically Sargon attributes to the Southern Kingdom '46 strong cities with walls and smaller cities around them without number', and we have the Hebrew geographical lists as some guidance. If we also allow for altars 'on every bare hill and under every luxuriant tree', some of which were not the altar in

[1] Cp. also modern custom as described by Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, pp. 164 ff.

[2] $2^{28}$, $11^{13}$. [3] $11^{13}$.

or belonging to a particular township, we may surmise that the priests scattered over the country in the simple service and guardianship of altars may have numbered in Judah, apart from Jerusalem, some 300 or 400; and we might double that number for the Northern Kingdom.

But apart from these ministrants to humbler and less famous altars or shrines there were the priests attached to certain great temples or important centres; such places were Shiloh, Nob, Bethel, Dan, Shechem, Jerusalem; with regard to these we have some information regarding the priests resident there; but there were also other places, such as Beersheba, where we might expect a number of priests.[1] Not all of these, however, were important priestly centres at the same time: Shiloh perished early, and only after its destruction did Nob become a priestly centre. At Shiloh we only hear of one family of priests—the house of Eli: but the story of Samuel implies that others like Samuel were attached to the service of the Temple there. And the same state of things we may imagine prevailed at Dan, where the only priestly family we hear of is that of Jonathan. At the 'king's sanctuary' at Bethel, Amaziah must have had his assistants; and indeed 1 Ki. $13^2$ speaks in the plural of the priests that burn incense on the altar there. Of one of these priestly centres we have a specific number given: the priests of Nob slaughtered by the command of Saul numbered eighty-five[2] and one of them, Abiathar, escaped. This eighty-five is the number of those wearing a linen ephod (1 Sam. $22^{18}$), and would represent a priestly population of perhaps 400 or 500. But Nob was obviously quite exceptional; it passed as the 'city of priests' (1 Sam. $22^{19}$), and we may safely infer that at no other place at that time were priests so numerous. Later in Jerusalem this number was doubtless exceeded, but at no time have we any precise figures given.

In all the places just considered there is reason in the nature of the cult for an unusual number of priests: this is not so with Anathoth, where yet we know that a number of priests dwelt: for Jeremiah was one of the priests of Anathoth. This instance

[1] Perhaps we might add some at least of the cities later claimed as 'Levitical'.

[2] G 305; $G_L$ 350; Jos. *Ant.* vi. 12. 6, 385 = Ahimelech and all his kindred.

is of value as showing that in various places for various reasons unknown to us several priestly families may have lived.

After this survey of relevant allusions in the pre-exilic literature we may venture on a suggestion as to the minimum number of priests, say in Judah in the seventh century B. C. Allowing for a priest at least in each of the 200 or 300 townships of Judah, for a large number in Jerusalem, for more than one priestly family in certain places such as Anathoth, we travel with difficulty up to 1,000 adult males of the priestly class. Yet perhaps we ought not as a minimum to think of them as much less numerous than this. We may then compare this with the inference obtained from the figures of the returned exiles: there we reached from 2,500 to 4,000 as the figure, according as we fixed the ratio of priests at a twelfth or a twentieth. Thus out of a population of 250,000 in Judah it is unlikely that the priests with their families ever exceeded 20,000 or were latterly at least less than 5,000. Within such wide limits we must be content to remain, except in so far as a consideration of the functions of the priesthood may serve to narrow them: and these may perhaps be satisfied by something near the lower limit, which would allow about 1,000 officiating priests in Judah.

We have spoken of a priest per altar: but the functions of the priesthood were far from limited to sacrificial duties: an equal or greater demand was made upon their time by other duties which may be broadly classified under the teaching function of the priesthood. For if the priest played a certain part as an intermediary between man and God when man presented sacrificial gifts to God, he also played a part, and a great part, as an intermediary between God and man when God spoke to man, or, as we may otherwise put it, when man sought guidance of God. In a word, the priesthood, especially in pre-exilic Israel, was one of the most important organs of revelation. Altered by later associations of the term, it is easy to over-estimate the sacrificial functions of the priesthood and to under-estimate its teaching function. On the other hand, when we turn back to the early narratives, so inconspicuous is the association of priests with sacrifice, and so readily does sacrifice appear to be performed without priests, and so far more conspicuous is the position of the priest as organ of revelation, that a possibly too

violent reaction from the traditional view is not unnatural, and it has even been suggested that the Hebrew priest had originally only teaching and no sacrificial functions: that the Hebrew *kōhēn*, like the Arabic *kâhin* or soothsayer, only instructed and did not, like the later priests, manipulate the blood and exercise other ritual of sacrifice. The patriarchs and others, e.g. Saul, it may be recalled, without being priests, sacrifice. Micah in the story in Judges finds a need for a priest not because he has built an altar but because he has erected a chapel and established an ephod, and the priests in Samuel are more frequently shown in action when the ephod must be consulted and the oracle obtained than when sacrifice has to be offered; and indeed even in this latter connexion the conspicuous part of the priest is not the discharge of ritual, but the receipt of dues (1 Sam. $2^{12ff.}$). But even if it could be shown that the teaching was prior to the sacrificial function of the priesthood, under the monarchy at all events the priesthood discharged both functions: so in the Blessing of Moses in Dt. 33 (ninth century B.C.) these two functions are set side by side, though significantly enough the teaching function is mentioned first: of Levi he said:

> [Thou gavest unto Levi] thy Thummim
> And thy Urim to the men of thy godly one.
> They teach Jacob thy statutes
> And Israel thy law;
> They set sacrificial smoke in thy nostrils
> And holocausts upon thy altar.[1]

To enter fully into the sacrificial duties of priests in this period would carry us over the ground of previous lectures, and I have already to-day suggested, so far as the data allow, the kind of supply of priests needed for altar service: but something more may be said of what is involved in the teaching function of the priesthood, though even here it is the broader aspect rather than details which will best serve to bring out the place and influence of the priesthood in ancient Israel.

In the lines just quoted from the Blessing of Moses the instructional side of the priests' activity is presented in two ways: (1) they possess the Urim and Thummim; and (2) they teach Israel the statutes and laws of Yahweh. We may interpret this

[1 Dt. $33^{8, 10}$.]

as meaning that the priests were the depository of traditional religious knowledge and were possessed of certain established methods of determining the will of God in reference to particular occasions as they arose. Much speculation has arisen in regard to the exact nature of Urim and Thummim, but the general fact that they were sacred lots is clear: in the well-known narrative in 1 Sam. 14 after God has failed to make an answer to a question put, by means of the priest as the context not obscurely hints (vv.[36ff.]), and the inference has been drawn that God's silence is due to some sin among the people, Urim and Thummim are used to discover the culprit: 'O God of Israel, wherefore hast thou not answered thy servant to-day: if this iniquity be in me or in my son Jonathan, O God of Israel show Urim, but if it be in (any other of) thy people Israel, show Thummim.'

Thus the priesthood by use of the Urim and Thummim instructed the people in obscure and uncertain cases, determining culprits, whether sin exists, as in the typical instance cited or otherwise, and in many other equally doubtful matters.

But then it was the duty of the priests also, as the Blessing of Moses informs us, to instruct the people in the statutes and law of Yahweh. These were the gathered experiences of the past on the most various subjects and sides of life: an early written collection of the statutes (משפטים) is to be found in Ex. 21–23[19]: these deal with various cases of law as affecting slaves, manslayers, persons committing assault, theft, injuries of various kinds, depositors and receivers of loan, creditors and borrowers, &c. As instructors in such *mishpāṭîm* as these the priests are to be looked on as the custodians of legal precedents, as teachers of the people in this learning which they gradually through generations accumulated as the will of God in social matters.

It is only in the later Priestly Code that we find a specimen of another kind of lore which must yet in origin be far earlier than the date of the composition of that Code.

In Lev. 13 we have a somewhat detailed description of the symptoms of the various types of leprosy. It is the duty of the priests to diagnose and determine the question of a man's ritual cleanness or uncleanness in accordance with the nature of the diagnosis. The stress here lies on cleanness and uncleanness, but it is easy to see how in this way the priesthood became in some

directions at least the depository of medical lore. Thus no less intimately than law was health and disease associated with religion, and with the priesthood as the regular exponents of the teaching of God in such matters.

But we cannot limit the learning or teaching of the priests to ritual, law, and medicine. They were also the custodians and teachers of moral precepts and practices, in which connexion we are commonly inclined to think mainly or entirely of another class of teachers, the prophets. But it was the duty of the priests also to be ethical teachers, for so only can we account for the various prophetic references to the teaching function of the priests. It is with the moral state of Israel that the prophet Hosea, for example, is at issue: and he traces the moral disorders of the time to the way in which the priests had discharged or had failed to discharge their teaching function. Even in the corrupt form of the text translated by E.V. the point is only obscured, and not beyond detection: with a slight and now generally accepted emendation the crucial passage reads: 'Yahweh hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. There is naught but false swearing and murder and theft and adultery: they break out and blood toucheth blood . . . my people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. Because thou, O Priest, hast rejected knowledge, I reject thee from being priest unto me: and as thou hast forgotten the laws of thy God, I forget my children.'[1] It is not, as an unreal but too frequently at least tacitly made distinction between prophet and priest might suggest, any lack of prophets that left people in ignorance of Yahweh's hatred of murder, theft, adultery, and such moral offences: it is the neglect of the priests to teach what they ought to have taught that is the cause.

How precisely the priests when they did not neglect their duty carried on this kind of teaching we are unfortunately not informed: in part at least, we may believe, it was as custodians of the historical lore of Israel. In his two brief sketches of the sheikhs of the modern Palestinian *welies* or shrines Curtiss makes one or two suggestive observations: these sheikhs are maintained at least in part by the dues paid by those who sacrifice, such dues consisting, for example, in a quarter of the animal sacrificed;[2] they

[1 Hos. $4^{1-2, 6}$.] [2] *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 173.

kill the sacrificial animal if for any reason the person offering does not prefer to do so himself; moreover, the sheikh acts in general as guardian of the sanctuary and is the perpetuator of the traditions regarding the origin of the sanctuary and the life of the saint in whose honour it is established. So we may believe the priests of the ancient high-places of Israel or of Shiloh with its more modest or of Jerusalem with its supremely important Temple preserved the story of Yahweh's manifestations on behalf of His people. And in course of time, at least at great centres like Jerusalem, they may have become veritable historians of the past: and in Israel history, no less than law, ritual, medicine, was sacred lore; it was the record of God's dealings with the fathers.

Our direct evidence on the teaching function of the priests is thus far from negligible: it may legitimately in some degree be filled out from general considerations and analogy. Of education in ancient Israel how little is definitely known! We cannot blame Dr. Box, for example, for the few words he devotes to it in his article on 'Education' in the *E.Bi.*, for bricks cannot be made without straw, but in addition to the *family* education in religion, of which a few biblical references allow us to say something, we can safely include in some measure as educational powers the priests; to them, too, we may reasonably refer a considerable part in the act of writing and composition.

And in general we may say that the priests were the most continuous [1] and recognized teachers in the country, and not always so neglectful or lacking in discernment as Hosea portrays them. They were custodians of the law, the prophets of the word of God, according to one prophetic saying; but the distinction is not to be gauged by any mere comparison of the terms 'law' and 'word', nor even of the subjects with which they dealt, as though the priests were teachers of ritual, the prophets of morality, for the priests, as we have already recalled, were charged with moral teaching. The difference lies rather in the manner of experience. The prophet spoke out of individual, direct personal experience; the priest out of the stored wisdom

[1] And still as late as seventh century—Jer. $18^{18}$, Ezek. $7^{26}$, Mi. $3^{11}$—the teaching function is immediately associated with the priest. So also priests, Lev. $10^{10\,f.}$; priests and Levites, 2 Chr. $15^{3}$, $17^{7-9}$—princes, Levites, priests 'with the book of the law', $35^{2}$; Neh. $8^{7-9}$.

and collective experience of his class. The great personalities are to be sought among the prophets; the living force in times of crises is theirs; but the maintenance of a permanent ethical and religious tradition, which needed at times, no doubt, vivifying by the direct law and challenge of the prophet, was the task of the priest.

In such tasks as I have just indicated, as well as in their ritual functions, lay scope enough for a considerable body of priests. A survey of these functions certainly does not enable us to determine with any greater precision than before the actual numbers of the priests; but it may serve, so to speak, to clothe with flesh and blood the mere skeleton of numbers; and to indicate the nature and ground of the influence in monarchical Israel-Judah of the thousand, two thousand, or whatever may have been their numbers, of the priests of Yahweh.

# XV

## THE PRIESTHOOD: LATER EXTENSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

UNDER the Monarchy the Jewish priesthood had a history of something under five centuries; from the Exile to the Fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70 of something over six centuries. In each of these long, but in length not very dissimilar, periods the priesthood underwent changes: it was not the same at the end of either of them as at its beginning. Some of these changes can be traced or their source conjectured: others remain obscure. But between the two periods there are certain broad differences in the political status of the priesthood, its constitution in relation to other religious classes, and its functions. And in these broad features the practice of the post-exilic period corresponds to the requirements of the Priestly Code. The argument that the Priestly Code belongs to the period whose practice—not in every detail at every part of the period, but predominantly over the whole of it—it regulates, and not to any earlier period the practice of which fundamentally differed from its requirements, has been recently, as e. g. by Eerdmans, called in question; but largely because attention is turned on details, and not on the broader aspects. In such cases criticism, even though it does not succeed in overthrowing the argument it sets out to invalidate, often illuminates side-issues. We are therefore well advised if we take account of both.

There is one broad difference between the two periods which I have just defined in the general social background against which the history of the priesthood has to be read. Between David and the Exile the Hebrew community contracted: between the Exile and A. D. 70 it greatly expanded. In the time of the united kingdom Hebrew priests were needed to supply the needs of a population of three-quarters of a million or a million; after the fall of the Northern Kingdom, i. e. for the

last century and half before the Fall of Jerusalem and the Exile, the population regularly served by the Jewish priesthood was but about a quarter of a million.[1] Immediately after the Exile, even allowing for the Jews who remained in Babylon, the Jews who had remained more or less true to their religion and as such needed Jewish priests were perhaps fewer than just before the Exile; but in the following centuries the Jews greatly multiplied alike in Palestine, Babylon, and Egypt, and had spread in smaller bodies into most parts of the civilized world, so that in the first century A.D. the Jewish priesthood stood related to a vastly larger number than that of those served by the Hebrew priesthood under David. This increase was already marked by the close of the fourth century B.C., at which date or later we may place the composition of the books of Chronicles, which happen to be a singularly full source for the history of the priesthood. The remaining sources for the period from the Exile to the close of the fourth century all belong to the period of the contracted community; they are mainly these: Ezekiel (40–48) in 571 B.C., the list of returning Exiles, Ezr. 2 = Neh. 7[6f.], if genuine, *c.* 538 B.C., the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, 458–432 B.C., and between Ezekiel and Ezra, if we adopt the now usual view as to the date of the composition, the Priestly Code.

The new *political* status of the priesthood after the Exile, its supremacy in Jewish life contrasted with its subordination to the monarchy, rests mainly on, or at all events finds its most prominent expression in, the position and function of the High Priest, and may be left for further consideration to the next lecture. Here we turn at once to the change in the constitution or extent of the priesthood and the subordinate sacred classes.

The broad difference between the constitution of the priesthood before and after the Exile is this: before the Exile the whole tribe of Levi, all individual Levites, were priests: after the Exile one section only of the tribe were priests, the rest were not and could not become such. On this matter we have the rare good fortune of a perfectly explicit, unambiguous, and clearly dated statement. In his sketch of the future constitution of Israel (571 B.C.) Ezekiel provides as follows: 'Thus says the

[1] Add any activity in the area of the old Northern Kingdom.

Lord Yahweh, . . . the Levites who went far from me when Israel went astray, who went astray after their idols, they shall suffer punishment (ונשאו עונם): they shall be servants in my sanctuary . . . (but) they shall not approach me to act as priests to me, so as to approach any of my sacred and my most sacred things. . . . But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the Israelites went astray from me, *they* shall approach me to serve me and shall stand before me to offer to me the fat and the blood,' ($44^{9, 10, 11, 13, 15}$).

Thus Ezekiel provides that henceforth Levites descended from Zadok shall continue to be priests, and that all Levites not descended from Zadok shall cease to be priests. In so providing, Ezekiel is amending a law promulgated fifty years before, and providing legal justification or indemnification for what had become in practice a disregard of that previous law. The Deuteronomic law, like Ezekiel, had treated of Levites as two classes; and the extent of the two classes both in Deuteronomy and Ezekiel is the same: the one class consists of priests hereditarily attached to the Temple in Jerusalem, the other of all remaining Levites. But whereas Deuteronomy provided that all Levites had equal right of priestly approach to Yahweh's altar, the priests of Jerusalem in practice refused other Levites the means of approach to the altar, and Ezekiel by his new law sanctions this refusal and perpetuates the extrusion of the other Levites from the altar and the priesthood.

The law of Deuteronomy was immediately put to the test: it was intended to regulate the life of an active and, in religion, a free community; and when tested the law proved impotent against vested interests.[1] On the other hand, Ezekiel's law could not be immediately put to the test; for it was put forward at a time when the Jewish community, at least the exiled portion of it, which portion included the sons of Zadok, was by the very fact of exile no longer even in religion free, but forcibly restrained from exercising its priestly functions; consequently another forty or fifty years had to elapse before it could be seen whether the sons of Zadok were to be left unchallenged in exclusive possession of the altar and all priests not hereditarily connected with Jerusalem would acquiesce in being degraded from their

[1] 2 Ki. $23^{9}$.

priesthood. In the interval the extent of the priesthood could, at least in Babylon, be only a question of theory and discussion, not of practice; in Babylon, Jerusalem Levites and other Levites shared a common exile and a common hope of return, and also a common incapacity for sacrifice; for them the legitimate altar had ceased to be, and no legitimate sacrifice could be offered. Of the course of discussion and theory after Ezekiel we have no direct record; but the outcome of it was that at the close of the Exile, when the community was restored, a division of Levites into priests and not priests was accepted and established: for in the list of the returning exiles the priests form one class, the Levites another and distinct class; and there is never subsequently any return to the pre-exilic recognition of all Levites as priests.

But was the division that prevailed in practice after the Exile identical with the division that Ezekiel's theory or law required? Or had discussion and compromise, while leading to agreement that not *all* Levites were to continue to be priests, modified the principle on which the priests were to be separated from those who were henceforward to be non-priestly Levites?

In this connexion one thing is certain: there is a difference of nomenclature. Ezekiel's priests of the future are sons of Zadok, but after the Exile the actual priesthood is known as Aaron, the house of Aaron, the sons of Aaron.[1] Are now the house or the sons of Aaron identical except in name with Ezekiel's sons of Zadok? Are they all descendants of Zadok as well as of Aaron? Are they exclusively priests hereditarily connected with Jerusalem? And is the alternative name merely a means of providing the sons of Zadok with a more ancient and illustrious title? Such was the view of Wellhausen,[2] formerly of Kuenen.[3] More probably, however, 'the sons of Aaron' was not, even when first used, a mere synonym of 'sons of Zadok', but covered a wider class, and represents an accommodation by which some of the Levites whom Ezekiel proposed to exclude from the priesthood ulti-

[1] So not only P but see Ps. $115^{10,12}$, $118^{3}$, $135^{19f.}$ (house of Israel, house of Aaron, house of Levi), 1 Chr. $15^{4}$ (the sons of Aaron and the Levites). $23^{28,32}$; cp. Heb. $5^{4}$, $7^{11}$, Sir. $45^{6-24}$, $50^{13,16}$, 1 Macc. $7^{14}$, Tob. $1^{7}$.

[2] Eerdmans, pp. 41 ff., but in ed. 4 We. distinctly assumes Aaron to be wider than Zadok, p. 122.

[3] *Hex.* 15, n. 15 end: modified *Ges. Abh.*, ed. Budde, p. 488.

mately maintained their priestly status. Certainly in Chronicles (i. 24) (*c.* 300 B. C.) the priesthood consisted of two great groups: (1) those claiming descent from Aaron through Eleazar: these included the Zadokites, 1 Chr. $24^3$ (cp. $5^{34}$ (E.V. $6^8$)); and (2) those claiming descent from Aaron through Ithamar.[1]

What non-Zadokite Levites in particular established their claim to exercise the priesthood along with the Zadokites must be much more a matter of conjecture. Vogelstein suggests that they consisted of the priests of Anathoth, the descendants of Abiathar of the house of Eli (cp. 1 Ki. $2^{26}$). Oort[2] in an elaborate study of the subject argued that the priests in question were priests, of a reforming temper, from the Northern Kingdom; that Aaron had long ranked as the ancestor of the priests of the north, especially of Bethel:[3] and that it was due to the accession of these that the term 'sons of Aaron' became the common title of the post-exilic priesthood. Dr. Kennett also, in an elaborate article on 'The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood' (*JTS* vi (1905), 161–186), like Oort, traces the Aaronites to the Northern Kingdom and in particular to Bethel, the house of the calf worship,[4] with which the story of the golden calf so closely associates Aaron (161 f.); like Oort, Kennett also lays stress on the fact that the worship of Yahweh continued at Bethel after the fall of the Northern Kingdom (2 Ki. $17^{28}$), but goes somewhat beyond Oort in arguing for a relative purity of the worship at Bethel (168 f.). In connecting these hypothetical Aaronites with the Zadokites and so accounting for the post-exilic as distinguished from the Ezekielian priesthood, Dr. Kennett strikes out his own line: his chief points are these: after the Fall of Jerusalem a large population remained in the land deprived of their priests, who had gone into captivity, but with access to their ancient seat of worship; this bereft population appealed (174) to

[1] Cp. Phinehas, Ithamar, Ezr. $8^2$.

[2] *De Aäronieden*, *Th. Tij.* xviii (1884) 289–335.

[3] Cp. ? Jos. $24^{33}$ (E: Addis, *E.Bi.* 2): Bethel (calf = golden calf of Aaron: E: *E.Bi.* 2 f.).

[4] The significance of this is greatly weakened by the fact that Dan, equally with Bethel, according to 1 Ki. $12^{29}$, ranked as a calf sanctuary and the priesthood at Dan was Mosaic! Kennett's attempt to parry this is not successful.

the Bethelite or Aaronite priests to exchange Bethel, eleven miles away, for Jerusalem, and they did so and were subsequently reinforced by priests from other parts of the Northern Kingdom such as Shechem or Gilead (175). The first of these Zadokite or Aaronite priests to officiate in Jerusalem during the Exile was Joshua, who later became the (high-) priestly colleague of Zerubbabel, and his father Jehozedek (176): by a genealogical fiction this Bethelite and by the hypothesis Aaronite priest was made the son (or grandson) of Seraiah, the last of Zadokite[1] priests before the Exile; and, by way of compensation, Zadok was traced up to Aaron. Dr. Kennett agrees with those who deny that any appreciable body of tribes returned from Babylon in the time of Cyrus: he allows that a few only returned and among them a few still had priests; but these had to accept the priest in possession, the Bethelite Joshua. This state of things lasted till Ezra and Nehemiah: when Ezra came up, many Zadokites came with him, and soon asserted their supremacy; henceforward the Zadokites—or, in the later form of the word, the Sadducees—were priests in Jerusalem, and the more independent members of the Bethelites went back to their own land and created the Samaritan schism. Thus the Zadokites recovered their own old position as priests at Jerusalem, and compensated themselves for the intervening degradation by retaining the ancient and honourable name of Aaron, which the interlopers had brought with them.

It is impossible to examine this theory in all its ramifications, for it rests on certain large critical questions which it would require long to re-open and re-examine: not only does Dr. Kennett adopt something like Koster's theory of the period of the return from Exile, but, pursuing a still less frequented path in literary criticism, he places Deuteronomy nearly a century later than criticism customarily places it—towards the end of, and not a generation before, the Exile.

But there is one general point not altogether bound up with these doubtful critical peculiarities which deserves consideration: it may be, as Kennett suggests, that the extension of the priest-

[1] 1 Chr. $5^{10}$ (E.V. $6^{14}$). But there was no need to make these Aaronite priests Zadokites, if descent from Aaron was to be the ground of legitimacy.

hood—limited in practice during the last generation before the Exile and in theory by Ezekiel living in Exile to the Zadokites—owed the expansion which existed, apparently, alike in theory and practice after the Exile, to the practice that had prevailed in Palestine during the Exile;[1] or perhaps we may rather say owed it in part, for there is no reason why two things may not have contributed to the total result: the practice in Palestine and discussion, leading to a concordat, among the Exiles; and we should be well advised to attribute most influence to the second, if our 4,000[2] priests really returned to Jerusalem in the time of Cyrus, for such a number is surely excessive for the descendants of the Jerusalem priests only.

So far we have been concerned with attempts to determine the relation of the Aaronic to the Zadokite priesthood on the part of those who place the Priestly Code with its theoretical Aaronic priesthood after the Exile—i. e. at the beginning of the period in which the actual priesthood was Aaronic. Before passing on, a few words may be said of Eerdmans's treatment of the subject in the fourth and latest of his 'Alttestamentliche Studien', which has curiously enough been warmly welcomed by some as a reaction to traditional views of the history of Israel. Eerdmans's discussion suffers somewhat from not being directly an examination of the origin of Aaronic priests but an attempt to prove merely a point in literary analysis, viz. that the term 'sons of Aaron' applied to the priests is not a proof of post-exilic composition. With this we need not necessarily concern ourselves. His theory of the relation of Zadokites and Aaronites appears to be this: long before the Exile the priests *at Jerusalem* claimed Aaron for their ancestor, and so were themselves 'sons of Aaron'. Thus in postulating pre-exilic 'sons of Aaron' Eerdmans is so far at one with Oort and Kennett, but whereas they sought them in the north he seeks them in the south: and whereas the calf seems to Oort and Kennett to point to the north and in particular Bethel as the original home of Aaronic priests, the ark (*'arōn*) is the clue by which Eerdmans found Aaronites in Jerusalem. Perhaps so far he is not on unsteadier ground than they; for as to the exact significance of the connexion of both calf and ark

[1] Cp. Stade, *A. T. Theol.*, 312 f., 268, 299, 348. [2] Ezr. 2 = Neh. 7.

with Aaron much might be said, but cannot be said now. For the rest I will quote his summary: 'The course of the history of the Israelite priesthood was briefly as follows: Among the pre-exilic priests of Yahweh who officiated at the various sanctuaries, and whose claim to office rested on their being Levites, the Levitical family of the sons of Aaron had always found employment about the ark. A branch of this family [i.e. descendants of Abiathar of the house of Eli] was expelled from, but subsequently re-admitted to the priesthood. The prophet Ezekiel sought to reverse this arrangement and desired that in the new theocracy the sons of Zadok only should be priests at the central sanctuary. His wish, however, was not fulfilled. All Aaronites in the post-exilic period were secured the same rights: the effects of the ancient feuds were completely broken. The priests, however, whose ancestors had never officiated at the national sanctuary were not admitted to the service of the altar. Possibly the pressing of their claims by (das Aufdringen) these non-Aaronite priests contributed towards uniting the sons of Aaron.'

This may sound a reasonable course of history, but it is not recorded history, and we can only entertain hypothetically its *reality* so long as we turn a deaf ear to the clear testimony of Ezekiel: for Eerdmans at once attributes to Ezekiel an attempt he never made, and entirely neglects the actual attempt which he did make to establish a distinction between priests and not-priests. Ezekiel has nothing whatever to say about two branches of the house of Aaron, or even of two sets of priests unnamed, who had at one time or another officiated *at Jerusalem*; and it is not one set of such *Jerusalem* priests that he seeks to deprive of their priesthood henceforward. What he does speak of most clearly is two sets of Levites who had officiated as priests at *different* places—one set in Jerusalem, and the other elsewhere; and what he does propose is that *all* priests who had officiated in Jerusalem, not only sons of Aaron as Eerdmans suggests, should continue to be priests.

Any detailed reconstruction of the processes by which, between the seventh and fifth centuries, the Jewish priesthood was limited and expanded must remain very conjectural: but the fact of contraction remains certain, and some expansion subsequent to contraction probable. Down to the Reformation of Josiah all

Levites were priests: after the Exile not all Levites were priests. That is the broad important fact that stands sure.

But processes of expansion and contraction were going on beyond the priestly circle, and, as the necessary results of these same processes, within that circle. The Levites who ceased to be priests did not become mere laymen—at least not all of them, though perhaps in exile some drifted from Judaism altogether, while others, though remaining Jews, practically lost any sacred or peculiar position.

Here again Ezekiel is our clearest witness, and here again Ezekiel marks out the broad difference between two periods, though what he required was not carried out to the letter in post-exilic practice.

Unless and until we have completely disabused our minds of the picture of the earlier history of Israel given by the Priestly Code and the literature that shares its standpoint, it must come as a shock to find unambiguous evidence in Ezekiel that right down to the Exile the Temple at Jerusalem was largely served not merely not by any sacred class of Jews, but not even by Jews at all: that the temple attendants were foreigners, men who had never undergone circumcision, the fundamental mark of every member of the Jewish community. 'Ye have brought in', says the priestly prophet, 'aliens, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh to be in my sanctuary to profane it when you present my food, fat and blood' (Ezek. 44[7]): these uncircumcised foreigners, as we may gather from the context (v.[11]),[1] had been accustomed to slay the animals which the Levitical priests then offered on the altar. This is no recent or passing usage that Ezekiel condemns, for he proposes to replace it not by a return to an old usage but by an entirely new usage. As a matter of fact the O.T. itself indicates with sufficient clearness the antiquity of the custom of employing foreigners about Yahweh's altar; for the older sources of the Pentateuch inform us that the Canaanites of Gibeon, for the ruse they had practised on the Israelites, were condemned to be servants of the altar.[2] Moreover, there is much

[1] המה ישחטו *they*, the Levites, henceforward and not as heretofore the נתינים.

[2] Jos. 9[23, 27]; in v.[21] most significantly P condemns the Gibeonites to the service not of the altar, but of the community. P is more remote than Ezekiel

analogy outside Israel for the employment of foreigners, captives and others, in ritual duties. Ezekiel's evidence is striking because it brings right down to the Exile a custom so flagrantly at variance with the practice and out of harmony with the sentiment of the post-exilic period. The void in the Temple personnel which Ezekiel would create by excluding the foreign servants of the Temple he would fill by utilizing the non-Zadokite Levites: they had sinned, such was his theory, and must be punished by being removed from the *priesthood*, but they were circumcised and moreover already set apart in Israel to Yahweh's service; they had proved disloyal in altar service, but under the eye of the priests at Jerusalem they may be kept right in subordinate Temple-service. Other Temple personnel than Zadokite priests and non-Zadokite Levites Ezekiel does not contemplate. How does this provision of Ezekiel work out in practice?

In this respect, what Ezekiel requires the Priestly Code also requires, and the practice of the *later* post-exilic period from something before 300 B.C. fulfilled in the main at least and probably completed: the entire Temple personnel was to consist of Levites and ultimately it did so unless, which is improbable, the Nethinim maintained to the end a separate existence. But the *practice* of the intervening period, say between 550 and 300 B.C., is transitional. For example, in the list of those who returned from Exile we find, in addition to priests and Levites, four other classes distinguished from them of persons who, as we learn from other references,[1] were closely associated with the service of the Temple: these are (1) the singers, (2) the porters, (3) the Nethinim, and (4) the sons of Solomon's servants. Of these the first and second were certainly, the third and fourth possibly[2] or even probably,[3] incorporated subsequently with the Levites. The first two classes may have been, and probably were, of Jewish origin; the last two classes, closely connected with one another so that the fourth is probably at times included in the third[4] without separate mention, were almost certainly of foreign

from the life of the pre-exilic community, and forgets or casts a veil over its offence in tolerating uncircumcised attendants at the altar.

[1] Ezr. $2^{40-58}$; cp. $7^{24}$.

[2] Benzinger, *E.Bi.* col. 3399; otherwise J. Jacobs, *Bib. Arch.*, pp. 104 ff.

[3] We., Now. [4] Benzinger, *E.Bi.* col. 3397.

origin. Thus Ezra ($8^{20}$) in his memoirs speaks of the Nethinim, 'whom David and the princes had given for the service of the Levites',[1] and to judge from their name 'the sons of Solomon's servants' claimed a corresponding origin from Solomon; but in the light of the story of the Canaanites of Gibeon assigned by Joshua to the service of the altar, we may infer that the gifts of David and Solomon to the Temple consisted of foreign slaves, an inference supported by the foreign character of the names of some of the families of the Nethinim and Solomon's servants. In the Nethinim, then, we may see the descendants of those Temple servants, 'uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh', for whose expulsion Ezekiel had called.

How then do the actual conditions of the fifth century stand related to the idea of Ezekiel? Over against Ezekiel's two classes stand, apart from singers and porters, in the time of Ezra three: Ezekiel requires priests, and Levites to assist priests, the latter taking the place and discharging the functions of dispossessed uncircumcised foreigners: Ezra ($8^{15-20}$) recognizes three classes—priests, Levites to assist the priests, and, in addition, Nethinim. These last are described by him specifically as assistants of the Levites (v.$^{20}$), but also, comprehensively, as being *in common with* the Levites 'ministers for the house of God' (v.$^{17}$): i.e. Ezra is conscious of a difference of origin of the two classes, subordinate one to the other, and yet seems to anticipate their comprehension in a common class. The Nethinim are still less than Levites, but seem to require titles to become Levites. And the way for their becoming such is prepared by the phraseology representing an attitude of P: in P the Levites are described as Nethinim, not of course being identified with the Nethinim given by King David to the Temple, but as given by the whole people from among their own number as a gift to God (Nu. $8^{19}$) to assist the priests (Nu. $8^{19}$; $3^{9}$). Thus P agrees with Ezekiel as to the two classes priests and Levites, and in a sense with Ezra as to the three names priests, Levites, and Nethinim; the real distinction seems to be that Ezra is not legislating but recording, and records a still existing and recognized distinction of classes

[1] The mode of expression is rather adverse to Jacobs's theory that the Nethinim were descendants of K$^{e}$deshoth and that their tainted origin was kept in fresh remembrance.

without indicating very clearly marked difference of function, for Nethinim and Levites together appear to discharge the function assigned to the Levites only by Ezekiel, to the Levitical Nethinim of P.

But while in form and letter Ezra differs from Ezekiel, in spirit he does not, at least he does not greatly. Ezekiel requires in the future the substitution of members of the Jewish community, and in particular Levites, for the aliens who down to the Exile had served in the temple; Ezra retains men of alien descent alongside of men of Jewish descent. But Ezekiel's fundamental objection was to the employment about the Temple of *uncircumcised* foreigners; and we can assert with assurance that the descendants of Ezekiel's uncircumcised foreigners, who were the ancestors of Ezra's Nethinim, submitted to the rite of circumcision and thereby became as proselytes members of the Jewish religious community, for as such, in common with the priests, Levites, and the rest of the people, they bound themselves by the covenant 'to walk in God's law' and not to intermarry with foreigners (Neh. $10^{29-31}$(E.V.$^{28-30}$)). Thus by the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the descendants of Ezekiel's foreign Temple-slaves were in reality no longer foreigners: by ritual act they had become Jews; and as sharing the same functions they were ready to become Levites.

This conversion of the Nethinim from uncircumcised foreigners significantly enough takes place in Babylon, for there is no indication that it took place between Ezra's return and the signing of the covenant, and it is highly improbable that Ezra should have invited still uncircumcised foreigners to accompany him from Babylon. More probably the transition took place early in the Exile: for once they were cut adrift from the Temple as their means of livelihood and settled in a land not Jewish, the almost inevitable alternatives were absorption into a non-Jewish society or formal and complete religious attachment to the Jewish.

Another noticeable fact is that the Nethinim who returned from the Exile were much more numerous than the Levites: in Ezr. $2^{64}$ (? 535) the Levites number 74 (+ 128 singers + 139 porters), the Nethinim with the sons of Solomon's servants 392: in Ezr. $8^{15f.}$ the Levites number 38, the Nethinim 220. It is thus clear that in *practice* the ranks of the Levites whom Ezekiel would have degraded and yet employed in the Temple, having become

depleted partly by transference to the priests, partly by unreadiness to leave Babylon, needed the Nethinim to fill them up. Nor is there any evidence that the Nethinim were at that time (ct. rather Ezra $8^{20}$) regarded as so degraded as Mr. Joseph Jacobs infers from Mishnic Talmudic references that they subsequently became. But are these Mishnic references, which deny to Nethinim the right of intermarriage with Jews, based on the actual practice of later custom or merely casuistical exegesis?

We may briefly consider the significance of these changes in the constitution of the priesthood for the functions of the priesthood. Apart from the changed political status, there is little completely new or little complete loss of old function. The priests still are attached to the Temple, still manipulate the sacrifices, and still exercise a teaching function: but the emphasis has changed, and the last of the three functions is becoming relatively insignificant and disregarded. It is true that the remembrance that Urim and Thummim were a peculiar mark of the priesthood, and the possibility of their restoration, are kept in view (Ezr. $2^{63}$); but Urim and Thummim have actually vanished and do not reappear: this particular method of priestly revelation and teaching has become extinct. By other methods, the method of tradition for example, the priests of course still teach the people the difference between clean and unclean and the like: but of the wider moral teaching of the priesthood to which the earlier prophets appeal there is little or no reference at this time; and if we find some parallel in the going about with the book of the law throughout all the cities of Judah and teaching the people (2 Chr. $17^{7-9}$), assigned by the Chronicler to the age of Jehoshaphat (cp. $35^{3}$—Josiah), but perhaps reflecting rather some condition of the Chronicler's own age, it is significant that in the exercise of this function the Levites are far more prominent than the priests; and in this we may see a confirmation of other evidence that teaching no longer ranks, as it had done in the Blessing of Moses (ninth century),[1] as a priestly function of at least equal prominence and dignity with sacrificing.

The reason or fact of this enhanced sacrificial and diminished teaching character of the priesthood runs back to the Josianic Reformation, but only becomes clear and decisive after

[1 Dt. $33^{10}$.]

the Exile. The enhanced sacrificial character of the priesthood is associated with the fact that it was on their competence to sacrifice that the division of the Levites into two classes was based; the Levite of superior rank, the priestly Levite, was the Levite capable of sacrificing irrespective of his capability of teaching; the lower Levite might have been an excellent teacher but he was degraded because he could no longer sacrifice.

And the diminished teaching function of the priesthood is associated with the fact that in this period a new source of revelation steadily becomes prominent and a new class of teachers. Practically right down to the Exile the word of God came either by prophet or priest, intermittently by the prophet, continuously by the priest; after the Exile prophecy becomes even more intermittent, but a new mode of revelation more continuous and pervasive than even the priest of old has come into play: with and after the Exile the Jews become the people of the book; more and more in the written, and less and less from the spoken word, they seek and find the will of God. Certainly the book needed interpreters and called forth a new class of teachers—the scribes. Among the scribes were priests, Ezra the priest being in some sense a founder or first member of the new order, as among the prophets of pre-exilic Israel there had been priests. But there is a clear, if in some respects not so great a difference between priest and scribe as between priest and prophet; and in proportion as the Scriptures became widely read and studied, and the scribes multiplied, the need for the teaching function of the priesthood grew less. So the priest as teacher becomes a negligible quantity; and the priest as minister of sacrifice acquires a correspondingly enhanced position in a community whose life was considered to rest, as on one of its surest foundations, on the due discharge of sacrificial worship.

# XVI

## THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD.

THE Levitical priesthood is a phrase that must possess a different significance according to our reading of Hebrew history: it will have one significance if we adopt as historical the theory that dominates the O.T. and later Jewish tradition; it will have another if, in the attempt to do justice to other theories or statements of the O.T. which though less dominant are yet sufficiently clearly expressed, we accept some critical reconstruction of Hebrew history. According to the one reading of the history, the Levitical priesthood, so far as that term may in that case be appropriately used at all, is applicable to the Jewish priesthood at all periods: i.e. the Jewish priesthood was Levitical in the same sense from its institution onwards. In the other reading, too, the priesthood was Levitical, in one sense or another, for the larger part of Hebrew history, but Levitical at different periods in very different senses.

According to P the history of the Hebrew priesthood is simple in the extreme: apart from the purely temporary priesthood of Moses, held for the purpose of the solemn institution of the priesthood, Aaron was the first Hebrew priest, and all subsequent priests were descended from him. But by descent Aaron was a Levite, and therefore in the sense that the priesthood was *within* the tribe of Levi it was always Levitical: on this theory at all times all priests were Levites, though at no time were all Levites priests. But there would obviously be no convenience in the use of the term 'Levitical priesthood', if such was the actual course of history; a narrower term would then be more appropriate for the Jewish priesthood at any and every period: it would be, from first to last what it did ultimately become, an Aaronic priesthood.

But there are other statements in the O.T. which imply a

wider priesthood, or wider priesthoods. One of the charges laid against Jeroboam is that he 'made priests from among all the people which were not of the sons of Levi' (1 Ki. $12^{31}$): the obvious implication is that *all* sons of Levi were legitimate priests, and that the priesthood at the time that this innovation was charged against Jeroboam was Levitical in the sense not merely that all priests were descended from Levi, but that all descendants of Levi were priests. That the terms 'priest' and 'Levite' were, as applied to cultic officials, co-extensive is also obvious in Deuteronomy. If we accept Deuteronomy as reflecting the conditions of the seventh century B.C., then the Hebrew priesthood of the seventh century was, and was exclusively, a Levitical priesthood in the widest and most appropriate sense of that term: all Levites were priests and all priests were Levites. But this state of things was followed by a narrower and preceded by a wider priesthood. It was followed by a priesthood confined to a section of Levites: this narrowing process can be traced from the next following, i.e. the sixth century: Ezekiel, in the first quarter of the sixth century, demands that certain sections of Levites shall *henceforward* be deprived of the priesthood which they had hitherto exercised, though in an improper manner, and that the priesthood should be confined to a certain clearly-defined section of the tribe. Ezekiel, so to speak, presents a bill for the contraction of the existing priesthood, and this bill in the course of the next century or so becomes converted, though not without some amendments, into an act: and so the narrower priesthood confined to the 'sons of Aaron' is not only the *theory* of the Priestly Code with regard to the Mosaic and all subsequent ages, but also the well-known *fact* of the post-exilic period and of the time of Christ. But the Levitical priesthood of the seventh century B.C., as it was followed by a narrower, so it was *preceded* by a yet wider priesthood, a priesthood which was not limited to Levites. In the time of David his own sons, though of the tribe of Judah, were priests; similarly, in the time of the Judges, Micah first appoints to the care of his private chapel one of his own sons, subsequently substituting for him a Levitical priest: whatever sense we place on 'Levite', whether a tribal or a professional, the last narrative makes it clear that there were priests who

were *not* Levites, as well as priests who were Levites. Thus we find in the earliest periods of Hebrew history a wider than the Levitical priesthood: we find this wider priesthood narrowed down by the close of the seventh century to a Levitical priesthood, and still further narrowed from the sixth or fifth centuries to a priesthood within but by no means co-extensive with Levi.

I have now just briefly indicated the main stages in the constitution of the priesthood as they appear to a critical examination of the entire O.T. in divergence from the theory of an unchanged and unchanging priesthood in P; and I have briefly indicated the main facts or statements on which that critical reading of the history rests. It is not my present purpose to argue, at least in any direct systematic way, the critical case afresh, or to examine the attempts which have been made to harmonize more or less completely the theory of P with the biblical statements which appear to be in conflict with it. What I do propose to do is to consider certain questions relating to the Levitical priesthood, taking that term in its widest sense, or in other words the Jewish priesthood prior to the Exile: and in particular the origin of the Levitical priesthood, its functions, its numbers and position relative to the entire Hebrew population. And in the present lecture I concern myself with the first of these questions.

And first a word as to the relation of the present to the previous lecture. I have attempted to show that according to early Hebrew tradition Moses was a priest, and indeed the first priest of Yahweh in the Israelite community. If, as later tradition and all the direct evidence on the subject in the O.T. assert, Moses was a Levite, this may appear to determine the origin of the *Levitical* priesthood, Moses being not only the first priest, but also the first Levitical priest; but the correctness of Hebrew tradition on this point has been questioned, and it has been held that Moses, in fact, belonged not to the tribe of Levi, but to that of Joseph,[1] or to some undefined non-Levitical tribe.[2] Without,

[1] Steuernagel, *Einwanderung*, pp. 99 ff. Cp. Stade, *A. T. Theol.* 28, 33.

[2] Gressmann, *Mose u. seine Zeit*, p. 214, on the ground that Moses, if a Levite, must have expressed pleasure that it was his own tribesmen who stood loyal to Yahweh (Ex. $32^{25 ff.}$). This is precarious. Over against such

then, allowing any great weight to the suggestion that Moses was not a Levite, the best course appears to be to discuss the origin of the Levites as priests independently as well as in connexion with the Mosaic priesthood; for in any case the closely related question of the extension of the priesthood from Moses to the whole tribe to which Moses belonged would arise.

In the earlier period of historical criticism the evidence available for determining the origin of the Levitical priesthood was entirely biblical. Within the last thirty-five years certain archaeological evidence, or at least what appears to be such, has presented itself. It will be convenient to consider this first.

In 1889 D. H. Müller[1] published a collection of inscriptions found six years previously by Julius Euting at El-Öla (العلى) in northern Arabia. The inscriptions were in different scripts and different dialects. Those which concern us were written in the alphabet of South Arabia and in particular in the form of it distinctive of the Minaean and earlier Sabaean inscriptions. The dialect of the inscriptions was also Minaean. The place of discovery is remote from the home of the Minaeans in southern Arabia; considerably less remote from Palestine and in particular from southern Palestine. In a line drawn from Gaza or Jerusalem to Ṣana' which sufficiently nearly represents the centre of the country occupied by the Minaeans in South Arabia, El-Öla lies at a point distant about one-third of the whole distance from Gaza: or approximately in miles it is 400 south from Gaza (or *c.* 330 from Kadesh) and 800 north[2] from Ṣana'. The contents of the inscriptions make it clear that a Minaean community was established here for a considerable period, extending over, as estimated by D. H. Müller, not less than nine reigns, and so not less than nearly two centuries: and there can be little doubt that the community in question was a trading outpost, not of natives of the surrounding district, but of Minaeans serving the homeland

considerations we may place in support of the direct statements of O.T., which appear to go back to our earliest literary sources, this consideration: that a peculiarly close association, both of Moses and of the tribe of Levi, seems to be deeply embedded in the stories belonging to our earliest literary sources.

[1] *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, xxxvii,* 2te Abteilung, pp. 42–43, 45.

[2] *c.* 650 and 1,300 km. on Guthe's map.

in its trade with the Mediterranean. Three of these inscriptions refer to certain persons described by the term *lawi'a* (𐪉𐪑𐪀𐪁), fem. *lawi'at*. From these inscriptions, which are unfortunately fragmentary, I cite so much as to render the context in which the terms occur clear.

In the first ($17^2$) we read: '[dedi]cated to Wadd the lawi'': [1] in the second: ($23^{1-3}$) 'he entrusted to Wadd and . . . 'Abdia and all that he possessed . . . the two [la]wi's': [2] in the third: ($24^{1, 2}$) 'his [lawi']at Salmay daughter of his lawi'at Âdat . . . [all that]? he possesses Wadd? (viz.) his lawi'at Salmay and his possessions.' [3]

So far facts. And now the questions are these: Is the term *lawi'a* in these inscriptions etymologically identical with the Hebrew *lewi*, Levite? If so, what is the significance of this identity—a question the answer to which must turn on the third question, what is the date of these inscriptions? It would lie far beyond the scope of this lecture to discuss these questions fully—and in particular the last: all I shall attempt is to indicate very briefly certain alternatives and possibilities.

And first as to the identification of the terms. Unfortunately the etymology of the Hebrew לֵוִי is not certain; one well-known suggestion is that Levi is a gentilic formed from Leah; even so its exact development from Leah has been differently explained. In this uncertainty we cannot, independently of other considerations, confidently assert etymological identification of the Minaean and Hebrew terms: the root א ו ל is in the inscriptions clear: the root in Hebrew is not, and in particular whether *lewi* in Hebrew is from a root containing א at all, and if so whether in the same position as in the Minaean inscriptions. Still the terms (Hebr. *lewi*, Minaean *l(a)w(i)*) resemble one another: and when we add to this that alike in the inscriptions and in Hebrew these similar terms both denote cultic officials, the probability of a connexion of some kind is considerable.

[1] 𐪉𐪑𐪀𐪁𐪉𐪀𐪉𐪆𐪎𐪁·|·

[2] ..𐪆𐪓𐪀𐪉𐪀𐪉𐪎𐪆𐪓𐪑𐪀𐪉
||𐪆𐪎𐪆𐪉𐪋|𐪉𐪑𐪁𐪀𐪉|𐪆𐪑𐪂𐪀
𐪋𐪓𐪆)|𐪀𐪉𐪑𐪀|𐪎𐪓𐪑𐪀𐪉

[3] 𐪋|𐪓𐪀𐪀|𐪑𐪓𐪓𐪑𐪀𐪉|𐪓𐪎𐪂|𐪆𐪋𐪂𐪉|𐪑𐪋𐪉𐪑|𐪑𐪓
𐪀|𐪑𐪆𐪎𐪀|𐪑𐪋𐪉𐪑|𐪎𐪓𐪑𐪀𐪉|𐪀𐪉|𐪑𐪎𐪎𐪆

R 2

In estimating the nature of such connexion, another fact may be significant: the term *lawi'* found in the Minaean inscriptions of El-Öla is unknown in the far more numerous Minaean inscriptions of the homeland in the south. We may, therefore, have to do with a use peculiar, so far as Minaean is concerned, of the community of El-Öla, and possibly, therefore, not with a native Minaean term, but with a foreign word borrowed by the Minaean community of El-Öla.[1]

On the question of date, wide difference of opinion prevails, which might be recalled but cannot be discussed here. On one theory—that of Hommel and others—the inscriptions date from *c.* 1500 B. C.: on other theories they are several centuries later than this, later, according to D. H. Müller, than Sargon, say *c.* 700 B. C.;[2] on no theory are they likely to be much later than this. In relation to Hebrew usage the important points are these: (1) On any theory a use of the term *lawi'a* at El-Öla reaches back far enough to be contemporaneous with the Hebrew pre-exilic use of Levite for priest: but (2) on one theory of date the El-Öla use is *prior* to the institution of the Hebrew cultus, if that is to be referred to the age of Moses; on the other theory the *testimony* to its use—the actual written record of it—is at least several centuries later. On the one theory Levite as a *cultic* term, but not in that sense a cultic term that had been originally tribal, might have been borrowed by the Hebrews from the Minaeans of northern Arabia—on the other theory of date this becomes, if not impossible, improbable, while an opposite possibility opens up, viz. that the Minaeans of El-Öla borrowed the term *lawi'a* from the Hebrews. If the terms are only similar and not in both languages normal formations from the same root, the connexion, if real at all, is probably one of borrowing on the one side or the other.

Turning now to the Hebrew evidence we take as our starting-point that the terms *Levi*, *Levite* have in Hebrew a clearly marked double sense: they denote commonly simply the tribe

[1] Cp. probably 𐩣𐩨𐩣𐩲 | 𐩣𐩧 ? = מגרל, used in El-Öla instead of 𐩣𐩲𐩡𐩧 among the Minaeans of the south.

[2] Meyer (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstamme*, p. 88), sixth or fifth century B. C.

or a member of the tribe of Levi, just as *Ephraimite* denotes a member of the tribe of Ephraim, and they also denote a person or, collectively, a body of persons exercising or having the qualifications for exercising certain cultic functions. Of course when once the whole tribe had received from a date at least as early as Dt. the same (minimum) cultic position, the two meanings as applied to adult males coalesce ; but there are the passages in the O.T. where the two meanings are distinct enough or in which one meaning to the exclusion of the other is alone applicable. The purely *tribal* character of Levi is clear in the Blessing of Jacob, Gen. 49, for here Levi is closely coupled with Simeon, and these, too, take their place along with the remaining ten tribes of the familiar list; Levi in Gen. 49 is a tribe as clearly as is Judah or Ephraim, and moreover it is a tribe without any trace of priestly or peculiarly sacred character : it is distinguished for cruelty, fierceness, remorselessness : 'in their anger they slew men, and in their self-will they houghed oxen : cursed be their anger for it was fierce, and their wrath for it was cruel.' The same tribal and secular character of Levi appears in the story of the deception of the Shechemites in Gen. 34. In the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33), later in origin than but similar in construction to the Blessing of Jacob, Levi still takes its place as one of the twelve tribes, but the blessing of Levi, unlike that of several of the other tribes, makes no allusion to any specific geographical position of the tribe : it is perhaps rather regarded as being, as Gen. 49 anticipated that it would be, 'divided in Israel and scattered in Jacob'; in any case Levi here, if or though a tribe, is also an association of cultic craftsmen : they, i. e. the tribe as a *whole*, are possessed of the sacred lot, they declare Yahweh's decisions to Israel ; they perform the peculiarly priestly acts in sacrifice. Any member of their association may have been thought of as descended from Levi—I return to this point : but he was certainly thought of as being a Levite in the sense of being a priest, a Levite in the same sense in which Aaron is so termed when Yahweh assigns to Moses to be his spokesman Aaron 'the Levite' (Ex. $4^{14}$).

By what process, and when, did the secular tribe become the religious guild ? for by some process and at some date this change must have taken place, if the Levi of Gen. 49 and Dt. 33 are the

same. The *religious* guild or tribe of Levi is one of the most certain and one of the most conspicuous features of all later Jewish history; and this is already in existence in the age of the Blessing of Moses, *c.* 550 B.C.: but how long before? The existence in early Israel of a *secular* tribe of Levi is by no means so conspicuous, and, so far, it is less certain: and attempts have been made to deny the existence of the secular tribe of Levi altogether. Benzinger (*Heb. Arch.*[2] 345 f.), for example, resolves both Simeon and Levi into astronomical figures: they are Gemini, the twins of the Zodiac. But, as Skinner[1] has well observed, even if there are astronomical motives in Gen. 49, the historic references cannot thereby be simply eliminated. Scarcely less desperate is Gressmann's attempt: Simeon was a secular tribe that broke up and lost its tribal existence. Levi, he suggests, was never anything of the kind. Levi, he remarks, unlike even Simeon, takes no part in the piecemeal conquest of Canaan by the several tribes as recorded in Jud. 1, and in Gen. 34 and 49 what originally was said of Simeon alone has been transferred to Levi as well: and so 'the existence of a secular tribe of Levi rests, perhaps, only on the phantasy of the narrator, who was acquainted with the priestly caste of the Levites and may have been able to represent to himself the origin of their rank (stand) only after the analogy of the all-prevailing tribal history'.[2]

These rather desperate explanations are not so attractive but that we could derive a better, even if we were compelled by the Minaean evidence previously discussed to reject the reality of a secular tribe of Levi and to hold that the Hebrew Levite was from the beginning, like the Minaean *lawi'a*, a cultic official. Certainly the Minaean evidence, if interpreted in a particular way, presents in connexion with the Hebrew dates very considerable difficulties. If the Minaean *lawi'a* meaning 'priest' was already in use *c.* 1500 B.C., and if it is identical with the Hebrew *levi*, the Hebrew tribal or caste name would appear to be derived from a term denoting an occupation or profession, viz. that of priest. Much of the usage of Levi in Hebrew could then be quite easily explained in accordance with Hebrew usage: 'the sons of the perfumers' are members of a guild or community of perfumers;

[1 *Genesis, ICC*, p. 517 n.] [2] Op. cit., p. 214.

'sons of the prophets' are prophets; so 'sons of Levi', if Levi originally meant not a tribe or the member of a tribe but a priest, would mean simply 'priests', and 'Levi' would be the personification of the craft or profession. And yet, though 'Levite' at times is used as a professional rather than a tribal term, it is not quite fairly used in Hebrew as a common noun: it differs, for example, from the synonymous *kohen*: the language speaks of priests of Yahweh, his priests, my priests, for example: it never speaks of Levites of Yahweh, his Levites, my Levites, &c.: this difference can be explained if the original significance of 'Levi' was tribal. But while Hebrew does not speak of 'his Levite', &c., the Minaean inscriptions of El-Öla do: and again the difference may be explained if 'Levite', while native to Hebrew, was borrowed at El-Öla: the language to which the term is native naturally exercises a greater restraint on the correct usage of its terms. In other words, Levi was never a secularist, but was always a priestly caste from the beginning—a condition not easily compatible with the description of Levi in Gen. 34 and 49. The tribe was priestly, too, before Moses, which would be even more at variance with the dominant (P) tradition of the O.T. On the other hand, if the inscriptions in question be late, and the term *lawi'a* in them derived not from the Minaean language, in which as already observed it is unknown, but from Hebrew usage, the difficulty disappears. A common explanation may suffice for its use of cultic officials both at El-Öla and, in the later as compared with the earliest period, in Hebrew. Such is the solution offered by Ed. Meyer, who holds that scattered members of the old secular tribe of Levi, after it had suffered the disintegration described in the Blessing of Jacob, moved some of them north from Kadesh into Israel and some of them south to El-Öla carrying with them the priestly traditions and craft of which, without being as a whole a sacred tribe, they were yet possessed in virtue of being the tribe to which Moses had belonged and among whom he had exercised his priestly functions.

But we must now turn to the stories related of the conversion of the secular into the sacred tribe of Levi, all of which by their very nature support the clear evidence of Gen. 49 that there was a secular tribe of Levi before there was a sacred caste of that name, and we must consider whether, as they stand, the stories or

any of them can be accepted, and if not, what light they may yet cast on the origin and character of the Levitical priesthood.

The later and, perhaps, but by no means so clearly, the earlier sources of the Pentateuch appear to agree in placing the conversion of Levi from a secular into a sacred tribe in the age of Moses—after the Exodus but before the entry into Canaan. According to the Priestly Code this conversion took place in two stages: first a particular Levitical family, viz. Aaron and his sons, are set apart to be priests; and subsequently the remainder of the tribe, according to the meaning of the name as understood by the writer (Num. $18^2$), are 'attached' to the priests as subordinate but still sacred ministers. All this occurred at Sinai in the second year[1] of the Exodus. According to D (Dt. $10^8$), by a single act the entire tribe of Levi was separated from the remaining tribes to perform the functions of ark-bearers, ministers of Yahweh, pronouncers of the blessing of Yahweh, i.e. the priestly functions. According to the view taken of the reference to the words 'at that time' in Dt. $10^8$, this took place at Sinai, or, later on, after the death of Aaron. The relevant narrative in JE[2] is most ambiguous, and so far as it has survived it certainly does not *directly* record a conversion of Levi; it has been customary to refer the whole passage in question to J (cp. Dr.): but there is good reason for treating it as composite—part E, part J (Gressmann, op. cit., p. 211). Here it is recorded, at the close of the incident of the worship of the golden calf, that Moses said, 'Whoso is for Yahweh, come! And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. And he said unto them, Thus saith Yahweh the God of Israel, Put ye every man his sword upon his thigh, and pass to and fro from gate to gate in the camp and slay ye every man his brother, his companion, and his neighbour. And the sons of Levi did as Moses said: and there fell of the people on that day about 3,000 men'. What follows in v. 29 is more naturally taken as parallel than as a sequel, and if so most probably derived from a parallel narrative. If then the incident, as told (say) in J, ends at the

[1] Cp. Ex. $40^{17}$, Lev. 8, Num. $3^{5-10}$. [2] Ex. $32^{25-29}$.

[3] Though originally the incident of the Levites may have stood in another connexion (Di., A. McNeile: see Dr. on vv. 25-9), and cp. Gressmann, op. cit., p. 215, who is indecisive.

point to which I have just read, it does not, in what survives of it, record the conversion of the tribe into a priesthood; but this may have followed—there are some reasons for and some against such a surmise—in a now lost sequel. Even in the narrative as it now stands, however, two features are noticeable: (1) Levi is still up to this point a secular tribe, and (2) it shows in a worthier cause the same ruthlessness attributed to Levi in the Blessing of Jacob: on this occasion too 'in their anger they slay men', only the narrative intends us to regard this as righteous anger at idolatry and zeal for Yahweh.

The present narrative continues in broken language which is scarcely original and has perhaps suffered farther than even the different readings of the LXX suggest: translating the present text very literally, it reads: 'And Moses said, Fill your hand to-day, yea (R.V., 'for'—Di. Dr. *al.*) every man against his son and against his brother, and for giving upon you to-day a blessing.' This is commonly understood to mean: 'Provide yourselves with sacrifices that you may be installed into the priesthood, for in placing the claims of Yahweh above the claims of kin you have shown the spirit demanded for the priesthood, and the blessing of this office Yahweh accordingly bestows upon you' (so, or substantially, Di. Dr. al.). Without entering into all the dubious features of this interpretation I merely point out two things: (1) to fill the hand is certainly a technical term for instituting in an office, particularly the priesthood, but elsewhere it is not the priest to be installed who fills his *own* hand, but another fills it for him; it is doubtful, therefore, whether Moses would have said 'fill your own hands' if he meant 'make yourself priests': and (2) even if the Levites are thus called upon to instal themselves, is it natural to call upon them to do so in hot haste at the fag-end of a full day culminating in presumably a prolonged slaughter of their kinsmen? I suspect, therefore, that Proksch and Gressmann may be on the right lines, though their translation of the last part of the verse may require more textual correction than they admit: there they render 'for every man at the price of (?) his son and his brother is to-day to win a blessing'—viz. the blessing of the priesthood. As to the first part of the verse I suspect there too an indirect allusion to the priesthood: I suggest that the imperative contains a *double-*

*entendre* and so an oblique reference to the priesthood: to fill the hand, as already remarked, is a technical term for instituting some one to the priesthood; it is also used, with an account of the weapon, of filling or arming the hand with a weapon (2 Ki. $9^{24}$); here then, perhaps, it is used primarily, with omission of the object, in this sense; and the command of v. 29 is parallel to the command, 'Put ye every man his sword upon his thigh' in v. 27: then the command in its direct and oblique sense is this: 'Fill your hands to-day on behalf of Yahweh with your swords,[1] and hereafter your hands shall be filled by another with the priesthood'. Thus v. 29, even though an isolated fragment (E ?), pretty clearly refers to the gift of the priesthood to Levi, the more fully preserved parallel narrative (J) far less clearly, if at all.

Be this as it may, P and D and probably still earlier sources J ?, E ?, Dt. 33, assigned the conversion of Levi from a secular into a sacred tribe to the age of Moses. Is that historically possible or probable? The reference to Levi in Gen. 49 is unfavourable to an affirmative answer to this question. For if, as is commonly believed, Gen. 49 reflects conditions after the settlement in Canaan, then Levi is still secular *after* the Mosaic age, and the stories assigning the conversion to the age of Moses are anachronistic. But even if we could accept (Van Hoonacker) the view that Gen. 49 reflects pre-Mosaic conditions, then another difficulty arises: Levi has then prior to the Mosaic age been scattered and divided in Jacob, whereas in these narratives of the Pentateuch it appears as no more scattered than the rest. There is no suggestion in any of the stories that its zeal in the days of Moses is wiping out a curse that had rested on the tribe from the days before the Egyptian sojourn.

Gressmann being prepared, as we have seen, to relegate the secular tribe of Levi to the realm of fiction, has freer movement than the harmonists in maintaining that the Levitical priesthood was instituted by Moses, though once again he differs from both the harmonists and others in holding that Moses was not of Levitical descent, and that Moses though a priest was not a Levitical priest. Gressmann's reconstruction of the history of the origin of the Levitical priesthood rests in part on general con-

[1] Gressmann (p. 212) fails to make this (from his point of view) rather obvious suggestion, though how he takes 'Fill your hands' is not clear.

siderations, in part on an analysis of the legends into pre-literary forms, and in part on external evidence. His general consideration (p. 463 ff.) is that a new god generally means a new priesthood; Moses introduced Yahweh as a new God to Israel; therefore he may be expected to have introduced a new priesthood,[1] i. e. to have expelled one set of priests and to have established another set. In his critical analysis of the relevant legends Gressmann is as usual full of suggestions, however far he may be from carrying his readers all the way with him; and in attempting to determine the local colour of some of the legends, e. g. the death of Nadab and Abihu, of their inter-relations and their association with struggles for the priesthood, he makes good many points. It is impossible here to follow his analysis in detail. As a result he reaches the conclusion that it was the work of Moses to establish a new priesthood devoted to the service of Yahweh to replace the old priesthood that had served the various Els or gods of the pre-Mosaic religion as Gressmann conceives it. The old priesthood did not give way without a struggle; in these struggles against Moses and the new priesthood Aaron plays the part of chief opponent to Moses; other opponents are Miriam, Korah, Nadab, and Abihu. On this theory Aaron, as little as Moses, is Levite by descent; nor is he, as in later Hebrew tradition, the head of the new priesthood: but one of the last survivors of an old priesthood. This very radical theory is able to give more points than either older harmonistic interpretations, or the critical theories which simply eliminated Aaron from the early literary sources of the Pentateuch and from actual history, to the still surviving references to Aaron's offences; in the present narrative of the Pentateuch Aaron sins and goes free while his companions in guilt are punished *by the Levites*; did he in earlier forms of the story suffer as well as sin with them? Did the story always run that he, the ring-leader alone escaped when the worshippers of the golden calf were punished? Or again, did he really escape when he and Miriam alike spoke against Moses, and was the woman alone made to suffer? Certainly

[1] The parallel—the only parallel referred to—of 1 Ki. $12^{31}$ is very imperfect: neither the God nor the priesthood of Jeroboam were really new. The alternative of maintaining the old priesthood but changing the object and manner of its service is as easy to parallel.

Gressmann has some strong points in favour of his analysis of the legends. But if we allow that he may be right, all that he so far establishes is that *a* priesthood was founded by Moses; the priesthood of Moses himself and a priesthood which as founded by Moses we might then term *Mosaic* he may then prove; but he cannot in this way explain the origin of a priesthood that was *Levitical*. On his hypothesis the priesthood chosen by Moses was chosen from zealous worshippers of Yahweh who *first* in consequence of their zeal become Levites or priests (p. 212 n. 1); they were not, by his hypothesis, Levites before, for a secular tribe of Levites did not exist. In order to explain how the priesthood is *Levitical*, Gressmann seems inclined to fall back on the Minaean evidence we have already considered (p. 464); at any rate he offers no other explanation why the new priests are, to tradition, *Levites*. If Moses introduced a new priesthood as well as a new God from Midian, it might appear a reasonable supposition that he also introduced as a specific term for the new priest a Midianite term. On examination the supposition that he introduced *lewi* as a foreign term for the priesthood of the new God Yahweh is seen to be exposed to serious objections. Not only, as we have already seen, is it the least doubtful whether the Minaean inscriptions of El-Öla are pre-Mosaic: but (1) how is it that the Hebrew language never uses the term 'Levite' of a cultic official with the same freedom as Minaean *lawi'a*, and as Hebrew itself uses its own alternative term *kohen*: the inscriptions of El-Öla speak ot *his lawi'a*, Hebrew never speaks of his Levite, though often enough of his or thy priests, &c.: Hebrew speaks of priests of Yahweh, but never of Levites of Yahweh: this is natural, if 'Levi' inHebrew always retained in some measure the sense of the original patronymic character of Levi, even when using the term with the secondary sense of cultic official: but it is not explained if in Hebrew *Levite* is a loan word from Minaean, where it was not a patronymic, but *only* a term for a cultic official. But (2) and perhaps more seriously: the name 'Yahweh' and the term 'Levite' cannot well be of the same origin. Granted the antiquity of the inscriptions, the term 'Levite' might no doubt have passed from the Minaean communities of northern Arabia to Israel, but there is no ground, quite the reverse indeed, for holding that the name 'Yahweh' passed from this community to Israel;

for the gods or divine names of the Minaeans are known in large numbers, and in particular too of the colony at El-Öla, but there is not the slightest trace arising there of the name 'Yahweh': if the name of Israel's God had been not Yahweh but Wadd, then the discovery of the El-Öla inscriptions would have proved that *Levite* as well as the name of Israel's God came from the Minaean: as it is, the case is very different. It is true that El-Öla probably lies within the region known to the O.T. as Midian; and from *Midian* the name and worship of Yahweh may have come, but in that case from the native population of Midian, not from some foreign trading colony in their midst; and so again there is no particular probability that *Yahweh* and *Levite* came the one from Arab native population, the other from the totally dissimilar Minaean colonists in their midst. That Moses was a religious eclectic picking up the name of his god from the Bedawin and the term for his priests from a trading community that knew nothing of the god of his choice is not a probable hypothesis.

We may admit the likelihood that in establishing a new name of God Moses also introduced new forms of cult, which in turn would invoke modifications in the services rendered by the ministers of the cult; but whether or not he dispossessed any close corporation of existing priests or endeavoured to substitute any close corporation of new priests we cannot say; what we can say is that long after Moses the Hebrew priesthood was not exclusively a corporation determined by real or supposed descent from Levi, but that priests who were Levites and priests who were not Levites existed side by side. Further, that though the priesthood was not exclusively determined by descent, yet at an early period hereditary priesthoods, such as that of Jonathan at Dan, and Eli at Shiloh, existed; but these priesthoods which they passed on from son to son admitted the incorporation or adoption of priests of another origin, an example of which we have in the attachment of Samuel the Ephraimite to the Temple at Shiloh.

How late did non-Levitical exist side by side with Levitical priests? How late, if at all, did the Levitical priesthood itself solemnly incorporate those who were not of Levitical descent? How wide and how general was this latter custom if it existed at all? The answer to these questions turns largely on the much

discussed and very variously interpreted blessing of Levi in Deut. $33^{8-11}$. The clearest antitheses between Levitical and non-Levitical priests are those in Jud. 17 f. and 1 Ki. $12^{31}$: in the one case we have a Levitical priest installed to do the work which had been previously done by a non-Levitical priest on the ground that he would do it better: in the other case the priesthood of the Northern Kingdom as distinguished from that of Judah is accused of being (largely) non-Levitical. Even in Judah, as late as David (*c.* 1000 B.C.) at all events, non-Levites were priests. On the other hand, in Dt. (*c.* 650) all priests are Levites: and at about half-way between these dates (*c.* 850 or 800 B.C.) the blessing of Moses certainly recognizes Levi as the sacred caste in such a way as not easily to leave room for other priests whom the writer would admit to having real claims to priesthood, though possibly in its closing lines, 'Smite through the loins of them that rise up against him, and of them that hate him that they rise not again', the author is thinking of *priestly* opponents, actual priests who declined without a struggle to yield to the exclusive claims of the Levites. If this be so, the tenor of the Blessing suggests that the conflict is drawing to a close in favour of Levi: its sacred functions the Urim and Thummim (*v.* [8]), the service of the altar, have already made Levi a prosperous community.

But does the Blessing of Moses represent the Levitical priesthood as a priesthood determined by descent, and absolutely closed to those who could not establish descent from Levi? Or does it, quite on the contrary, express entire indifference to descent? Is Levi a close corporation, indeed, insisting on the sole right of its members to exercise priestly functions, and yet a corporation freely recruited without regard to kin? What, in other words, is the meaning of the first two quatrains of the Blessing: And of Levi he said:

[Thou gavest unto Levi] thy Thummim,
And thy Urim to the man (men) of thy godly one
Whom thou provedst at Massah,
With whom thou strovedst at the waters of Meribah:
Who said (saith) of his father (and his mother) I have not seen him,
And who recognized (recognizes) not his brothers

For they kept (keep) thy word,
And guarded (guard) thy covenant.

Is the indifference to kin here asserted of Levi an allusion to a definite *past* event—the indiscriminate slaughter of offending Israelites in the wilderness, or rather perhaps at Meribah, i.e. Kadesh—or to a *present* characteristic of Levi: and in the latter case, does it mean that the Levites in the administration of justice show no partiality, or that in order to be Levites they cut themselves adrift from their kin—from parents, brothers, children? In the last but only in the last case does the Blessing show that as late as 500 B. C. the Levitical caste was recruited not by descent, but from beyond the kin of existing Levites. But for this to be probable the wording seems too strong: what is asserted is asserted of the whole caste: it would not naturally correspond to a state of things which admitted occasionally of a solemn adoption into the caste from beyond the kin. Again, the words assert equal indifference to father and children: and should, therefore, mean that as Levites were recruited from without, so also they did not normally after admission to the caste transmit their position to their children. But this seems at variance with the considerable evidence that exists of hereditary priesthoods alike in the Northern (Dan, Shiloh) and in the Southern Kingdom (Jerusalem) before *c.* 800 B. C.

But though the priestly tribe or caste of Levi sat by no means so loose to kin as the interpretation of Dt. 33 just discussed would indicate, it is possible, in spite of the protest against Jeroboam, that some means existed of duly and solemnly adopting from without individuals or even classes into the Levitical order; and certainly this possibility cannot be lightly disregarded if, even after the more stringently expressed limitation to descent which we find in P, certain classes such as the singers, porters, if not the Nethinim, also were adopted into Levi. But this carries us beyond the limits of the present lecture.

# XVII

## THE HIGH PRIEST

BEFORE the Exile kings, after the Exile high priests—so according to a particular reading of Jewish history may the difference, so far as government and the influence of the priesthood are concerned, between the two periods be briefly yet with substantial truth summed up; the direct assertion indeed cannot be and is not challenged, but the implicit negations—before the Exile no high priests, after the Exile no kings—also are substantially true; for the second of these negations is scarcely qualified by the fact that for a period from 104 B. C. there were again Jewish kings, since these were high priests who had added the regal to their priestly title, thereby enhancing and not by a division of authority diminishing the prestige of the priesthood. But can the first[1] negation: before the Exile no high priests, be equally defended? Is it the fact that there were no high priests before the Exile? And if not, were such high priests as there were essentially different from those who constituted the high priestly line after the Exile? I will, to begin with, briefly consider this question, partly because what had come to be the prevailing critical opinion has been recently questioned by Eerdmans, and partly because such a consideration helps to define certain important features in the later priesthood—of the priesthood I say advisedly, for, unique though and where the high priest was, he was always priest, and the enhanced dignity of the high priest accordingly means the enhanced prestige of the priesthood.

Eerdmans thus describes the position which he seeks to overthrow:[2] 'The Kohen haggadol passes for a creation of the post-exilic period. He is termed by Wellhausen the keystone of

[1 Dr. Gray's MS. has 'second'—clearly a slip. Ed.]
[2 *Alttestamentliche Studien iv. Leviticus*, p. 34 f.]

the holy building set up by the Jews of P. A figure of such incomparable importance is foreign to the rest of the O.T.; even Ezekiel knows nothing of a high priest of supreme holiness. In the law Aaron occupies a unique position like the Roman pontifex over against the bishops. He only is the one fully authenticated Priest. He alone wears (*trägt*) the Urim and Thummim and the ephod. He alone may enter the Holy of Holies and offer there the offering of incense. At his investiture he is anointed like a king, and is called accordingly the anointed priest: like a king he is adorned with diadem and tiara, and like a king he wears the purple. Wellhausen explains this royal array of the priest as indicating that the nation now lives a merely spiritual and ecclesiastical existence, and therefore dresses up (arrays) its priest like a king.'

Except in the first and last of these sentences, Eerdmans fairly reproduces Wellhausen's description: but the exceptions are important. So far from questioning that there existed before the Exile priests who might have been called high or great priest—whether they actually were so described or not is a matter of quite secondary importance—Wellhausen himself points out that before the Exile differences of rank and office existed in the priesthood at Jerusalem, that we hear of a chief priest there, of a second priest, and of elders of the priests, and that we see that the chief priest had considerable influence in securing positions for his colleagues of lower rank.[1] It is a mere show of counter-argument, therefore, when Eerdmans appeals on the one hand to the same passages and in addition to the particular instances of (chief) priests in Jerusalem, such as Abiathar, Zadok, Jehoida, Uriah, Hilkiah, and on the other, perhaps rightly, argues that some of the passages in which הכהן הגדול occurs are pre-exilic, to prove that high priests existed before the Exile. For the question at issue is not whether persons were called high or great priests before the Exile, but what was the actual place of the most important priest before the Exile in the national life of the entire kingdom? Did he occupy a unique position in the community, supreme not only among the priests, but all the people? Was

[1] 2 Ki. $11^{18}$, $12^{7,10}$, $19^{2}$, $23^{4}$, $25^{18}$; Jer. $19^{1}$, $20^{1}$, $29^{25f.}$

he 'great' among the priests of a particular place? Or was he great among all the priests? Wellhausen's actual contention is that *such a high priest as is depicted in P*, a priest not only chief but supreme, did not exist before the Exile, whereas the actual high priest of the post-exilic period does correspond to the high priest described in P. This contention Eerdmans fails to meet: though it is interesting and significant to observe that he tacitly admits the correctness of Wellhausen's description of the high priest as presented by P; what he attempts to do is to show that such a high priest also existed before the Exile. Van Hoonacker adopts the alternative view of criticism, for which there is, perhaps, more to be said, that the actual high priest even after the Exile does not correspond to the description of P.

One important and significant feature of the high priest in P, Eerdmans makes no attempt to explain, viz. that his death marks an epoch; it is not in P, as it was before the Exile, the death year of the king that marks an epoch (Is. $6^1$), but the death year of the high priest: when a high priest dies, the man-slayer is released from the city of refuge (Num. $35^{25}$). Other features which together account for the unique position and pomp of the high priest in P, Eerdmans attempts to prove to have existed before the Exile, and this by what he terms 'die religionsgeschichtliche Interpretation des A.T.', i. e. the interpretation of the O.T. based on comparative religion. But Eerdmans, in common with some other distinguished scholars, is inclined to use the 'religionsgeschichtliche' method in an illegitimate way: comparative religion may and does illuminate history, but it cannot override, nor can it become a substitute for, history; it may explain a rite historically proved to have been practised in a given place and at a given time: it cannot by itself prove that a rite recorded to have been practised in certain places and at certain times was also practised at other times and in places not recorded. In P the high priest 'at his investiture is anointed like a king' (Wellhausen). Is this a legitimate statement, and, if so, is the fact involved significant? Eerdmans attempts to rob it of significance by arguing that priests were anointed before the Exile: of this there is no direct evidence; and the fact that the study of religions has brought to light many rites

of anointing both of persons and things does not prove that the rite applied to priests under the Hebrew monarchy. But even if it did, or even if there were other satisfactory proof that priests were anointed under the monarchy, it does not really affect the point that Wellhausen rightly makes. Under the monarchy, whatever be the fact about priests, the king was not the only person anointed, for we hear of the anointing of a prophet (1 Ki. $19^{16}$); nevertheless, the king was the outstanding example of anointed persons, and was, *par excellence*, 'the anointed of Yahweh': similarly in P the really significant thing is not that the high priest is anointed, but that he is, what before the Exile the king was, the outstanding, even if not the only, anointed person: he is not actually, like the king, termed 'the anointed of Yahweh', but the terms employed are equally expressive: he is 'the anointed priest' (Lev. $4^{3,5,16}$, $6^{15}$ [E.V. $^{22}$]), 'the high priest who was anointed with holy oil' (Num. $35^{25}$);[1] and the act of anointing so applied to him is described in Ex. $29^{7}$, Lev. $8^{12}$ in terms recalling the anointing of a king in 1 Sam. $10^{1}$, $16^{13}$. In later strata of P anointing is extended to the ordinary priests (Ex. $30^{30}$): and yet the high priest remains distinguished as the anointed.[2] It is not impossible that in this we have traces of some form of priestly anointing that extended to all priests (cp. Ex. $29^{21}$, different from v. $^{7}$).

Another feature which, alike in P and in the actual life of the post-exilic period (cp. Ecclus. $50^{11}$), contributed to the almost regal pomp of the high priest is his dress. Of *such* distinction, even though there may have been *some* distinction, we have no pre-exilic evidence. Eerdmans is here peculiarly weak. He claims that in distinguishing the high priest from the ordinary priest P agrees with pre-exilic practice as described in Samuel. 'Of this' (i.e. Eerdmans's pre-exilic high priest) 'it is said that he wears (*trägt*) the ephod (1 Sam. $2^{28}$, $14^{3}$, $23^{6}$, $30^{7}$), whereas the usual official dress of the priests was, according to 1 Sam. $2^{18}$, $22^{18}$, the linen ephod. There must have been a distinction between the ephod and the linen ephod. This agrees with the representation of P that the official garments of the high priest could

[1] Cp. further Lev. $16^{32}$, and P (questioned by Eerdmans, op. cit. p. 103) on the context of H, $21^{10,12}$.

[2] Cp. 2 Macc. $1^{10}$, Ἀριστοβούλῳ . . . ὄντι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν χριστῶν ἱερέων γένους.

only be worn by him, and were different from the garments of the other priests.'[1] That there was a distinction between the two ephods is correct: for the rest, Eerdmans's statement is singularly incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading. To discuss this fully would carry us into the long and difficult questions concerning the various ephods; here it must suffice to remark (1) that in all the passages cited by Eerdmans for the ephod which he infers to have been restricted to a high priest, it is said to be carried (נשא) or brought (הגיש), never that, like the linen ephod, it was worn (לבש); (2) that in three (the first three) out of the four passages *an* ephod (אפוד), not *the* ephod, is spoken of, and that in the fourth the article is used for a particular ephod defined by the context, not of a unique article belonging to a unique person; and (3) that in 1 Sam. $2^{28}$ the carrying of the ephod is mentioned along with other functions common to the priesthood as a whole: the whole tribe (בית = איש) had been chosen to be Yahweh's priest (not high priest) in order to go up to the altar, to burn incense, and to carry an ephod before him.

In spite of this counter-criticism we must maintain as fact that the high priest of the post-exilic period was something sharply distinguished from any priest under the monarchy before the Exile; we may also maintain that the high priest of P more closely resembles the post-exilic high priest; and even if such a high priest as P describes existed *before* the monarchy, to wit in the Mosaic age, *under* the monarchy, i. e. for many centuries before the Exile, there had been no such high priest.

The essential feature of the post-exilic high priest (or let us, to be more strictly accurate, say with the exception of short periods) is this: he is the supreme priestly and also the supreme *Jewish* civil figure in the community; when the Jews were a subject people, as for the greater part of the period they were, the high priest was the highest native official, answerable for the people to the sovereign power; when for a brief period the Jews were free, the high priest, at first in substance and afterwards also nominally, was also king. The high priest occupies the highest rank in the community; and next to him come not princes but priests.

We may find anticipations of this position of the high priest

[1] Op. cit., p. 39.

earlier, we can observe the development of a politico-religious theory favourable to it, and finally perceive the actual political conditions that almost inevitably produced it. Anticipations of the supreme high priests of the entire nation or community of post-exilic times we can detect in the existence, even before the Exile, of priests of varying degrees of importance or rank among the large priestly community of Jerusalem. The favouring politico-religious theory is that of Ezekiel, which in a more explicit form underlies the Priestly Code. But I deliberately single out Ezekiel although, as has so often been observed, he himself does not introduce a high priest into his politico-religious scheme, and does introduce a prince. But the prince of Ezekiel's state holds a precarious position, and for the high priest, who is not yet there, everything is ready and favourable. What Ezekiel does is to glorify the ideal of a closely organized and sharply defined priesthood, and to make that priesthood the central and supreme class in the community; consequently a chief priest of *this* priesthood, if such should become distinguished, becomes almost inevitably the high priest of the post-exilic period: he will be no longer, as before the Exile, chief merely of the priests of a particular locality; but chief of the entire priesthood, which in its turn is as a whole the chief among the classes of the entire community. The absence of the chief priest in Ezekiel is associated with the absence of another conspicuous feature of the post-exilic community, viz. the Day of Atonement, i.e. with the absence of the only conspicuous ritual which the high priest alone was competent to perform; all the ritual functions, and indeed all the functions of any kind assigned by Ezekiel to the priests, could to the very last be performed by any priest. Ezekiel had thus no ritual necessity for a high priest; and he thus finds no necessity to regulate rank within the priesthood. He was familiar before he became an exile with the pre-exilic differences of rank, but he does not find it necessary to provide explicitly for their restoration; he does not provide for a high priest of the post-exilic type because he had known no such person in actual life, and, moving now entirely in the realm of theory and ideal, he does not perceive the necessity for him. Enough for him that the priesthood *as a whole* is supreme. On the other hand, influenced by the actual life of his youth, he does

recognize a king under the title of prince: but, diagrammatically, this prince is only allowed a place *beside* the priests; they are central and supreme, he is a mere side-issue. Moreover, Ezekiel leaves this prince without essential functions: he is to act as middleman between the people and the priesthood for the supply of the materials of sacrifice, but such a middleman is obviously unnecessary either to people or priesthood, and can be removed almost unnoticed and without the least effect from Ezekiel's scheme.

Curiously enough, in the first years after the Exile priest and prince actually stood for a brief spell together, Zerubbabel the prince and Joshua the priest. But Zerubbabel the prince, descendant of the ancient royal Davidic line, and perhaps on that account brought under the suspicion of the Persian government, disappears leaving no successor. Henceforward the dual headship of the community becomes single in the person of Joshua the priest, and so continues in his family for over three centuries: and the high priest becomes the single unchallenged head. This actual course of events after the Exile has again a curious analogy in P's account of the Mosaic age: for there, too, at first Moses and Aaron stand side by side, but the successor of Moses is subordinated to the successor of Aaron: Joshua must act on the orders of Eleazar the priest (Num. $27^{21-23}$).

P seems to contemplate the office of high priest being hereditary, and certainly to be held for life, since only an office of lifelong tenure is suitable to the provision that the manslayer must remain confined to the city of Refuge till the high priest dies. Between Joshua at the end of the sixth century and Onias III at the beginning of the second, *in practice* the high priesthood appears to have been hereditary,[1] though not always descending according to a strict rule of primogeniture[2] or held for life. In spite of this long tenure of the office by a single family, this house of Joshua, as we may call it, never established the same sort of abiding right to it that the house of David had to the crown of Judah. Theory required that a descendant of *Aaron*, who was at once the first priest and the first high priest,

[1] Neh. $12^{10 f.}$ and Jos. *Ant.*: references in Schürer, *E. T.*, I. i. 188 f.

[2] For between Simon I and his son Onias intervened a brother and an uncle of Simon: Schürer, ib.

should be high priest; but then any priest was a descendant of Aaron, and as such, as events proved, could be called to the high priesthood without provoking any permanent sense of illegality. It was necessary that the chief of the Jewish community should be priest: it was not necessary that he should be priest of any particular family: for so we interpret the facts of the Maccabaean period and the manner in which they were regarded. To put it otherwise, the distinction between priest and high priest never became so rigid as between priest and Levite: in the one case there was an impassable chasm, in the other there was not (2 Macc. $4^{7-10}$).

Onias III was virtually expelled from the high priesthood by his brother Jason, who assumed the office in his stead: this was a violation of the law of lifelong tenure, but did not abnormally disturb the succession. The next event is far more extraordinary; Jason was turned out of office by Menelaus, who in the words of 2 Macc. $4^{23 f.}$ 'outbidding Jason (at the Seleucid court) by 300 talents of silver secured the high priesthood for himself' and 'on receiving the royal mandate appeared in Jerusalem, possessed of no quality which entitled him to the high priesthood'.[1] Though Josephus makes Menelaus another brother of Onias, and so of the old high priestly line, he was, according to 2 Macc. ($4^{23}$, $3^4$), not merely unrelated to the preceding high priests, *but not even of priestly descent*; he was of the tribe not of Levi, but of Benjamin. This is an extraordinary episode in the history of the high priesthood: the intrusion of a layman it is difficult to believe was invented, though on the other hand it is perhaps a little curious that the references to it do not more explicitly express horror and disapproval. The difficulty is not to be met by the supposition that Menelaus received the title of *ἀρχιερεύς*—on Bücheler's hypothesis an alternative to *προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ* in 2 Macc. $3^4$ (see Moffatt, ad loc., Guthe, *E.Bi.* 3505) —for Menelaus is represented not as a merely titular high priest alongside of an actual high priest (ct. 2 Macc. $4^{23-26}$), but as a supplanter of an actual high priest and consequently as himself high priest in the fullest sense; he was a usurper, a sacrilegious usurper, but still for the time being *de facto* high priest.

But this intrusion into the priesthood of laymen—for Menelaus'

[1] *Τῆς μὲν ἀρχιερωσύνης οὐδὲν ἄξιον φέρων* [$4^{25}$].

brother Lysimachus also acted as high priest (2 Macc. $4^{29}$)—was a brief episode, never commonly accepted and never repeated after the violent deaths of Lysimachus and Menelaus. But the high priesthood does not return to the house of Joshua. Is it then correct to speak of Onias II (I), as the 'last legitimate high priest of the Jewish community in Jerusalem' (Guthe, *E.Bi.* 3508)? Is Jason illegitimate because he prevented Onias from completing a lifelong high priesthood? Are all subsequent high priests illegitimate because they were not descended from Joshua, but sprung from a different priestly family? It seems very doubtful whether this corresponds to the actual sentiments or theories of the time.[1] All that seems to have been regarded as absolutely essential, so far as descent is concerned, is that the high priest should be of priestly, i.e. of Aaronic descent. After the death of Menelaus the Seleucid government appointed Alkimus high priest.[2] Of this Alkimus Josephus (*Ant.* xx. $10^{3}$) says in one place that he was 'of the stock of Aaron, though not of the house of Onias': in another (*Ant.* xii. $9^{7}$) that 'he was not of the high priest stock (ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων γενεᾶς)' but of 'another (ἑτέρου) house'. The latter expression may suggest illegitimacy: but weight need not be attached to this late opinion of Josephus nor to the contrary implication of 2 Macc. $14^{7}$, where Alkimus is made to speak of 'my ancestral glory, meaning the high priesthood (*τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν λέγων δὲ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην*)', as though he were immediately related to the preceding high priests. What is really significant as to the theory of the high priesthood is that in contrast apparently to the *Benjamite* Menelaus, the strict pietist party of the Hasidaeans were content to accept a nominee of the Seleucids, if only he were of Aaronic descent (1 Macc. $7^{14}$). What seems to underlie this attitude is this: that the foreign suzerain has the right to determine the Jewish chief officer in secular affairs and that this chief was eligible for the supreme priestly position provided only he was a priest. The descendants of Onias, or some of them, migrated to Egypt and became priests of the Temple of Leontopolis: this

[1] The obscure and ambiguous reference to the cutting off of *an* anointed one (? Onias III) in Dan. $9^{26}$ certainly does not prove the existence of such a sentiment.

[2] 1 Macc. $7^{9}$, 2 Macc. $14^{3}$, Jos. *Ant.* xx. $10^{3}$.

may have prevented any legitimist aspirations and party successfully gathering round the family of Onias: in any case, of any abiding legitimist theory we have no trace, but rather the reverse. We have, regarded from the point of view of ground of tenure, three different classes of high priests: from Joshua to Onias III ($3\frac{1}{2}$ centuries) a succession, so far as we can judge, of *de facto* high priests recognized by the Persian and subsequently by the Ptolemaic or Seleucid courts; then, for a few years, nominees of the Seleucid court; and then, after seven years when there was no high priest (Jos. *Ant.* xx. $10^3$), high priests popularly chosen by the Jews gradually establishing a fresh hereditary line. These last are the Hasmonaeans or Maccabaeans. In spite of a statement of Josephus, it is improbable[1] that Judas ever filled the office of high priest, but Jonathan did, and with reference to Simon we have the definite statement of popular election: 'And the Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until a faithful prophet should arise' (1 Macc. $14^{41}$). This admits the possibility that the high priesthood may be removed from the Hasmonaean house, but it tacitly takes a most decisive farewell of the family of Onias. And under Simon's successors the Hasmonaeans so completely secure their position, that when exception is taken to John's competence for the office, it is not on the ground that his paternal descent is open to question—in other words, that the right of the Hasmonaean house to the high priesthood is in any doubt—but that his mother had been a captive (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. $10^5$), and that therefore Hyrcanus in particular was of doubtful competence to discharge *priestly* duties.[2]

After the Hasmonaeans come the twenty-eight high priests who fill out the 107 last years from Herod to the fall of Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant.* xx. 10). These, with the exception of the last who owed his office to popular election, were nominees of the Herods and the Agrippas, or of the Roman government: they were not selected from a single family; and they did not hold office for life, but rather for only a few months or years. None of these nominations offended, as had that of Menelaus by the Seleucid government, against the fundamental requirement that the high priest should be of the seed of Aaron; and this being so the community

[1] Ct. 1 Macc. $8^{20}$ with $12^3$.

[2] Cp. *K'etub*, iii. 9, iv. 8; *Ḳid.* iv. 6.

appear to have found no difficulty in acquiescing: and the Mishnah later quite calmly compares the differences between a high priest actually in office and a high priest out of office (Horaioth, $3^4$).[1]

This last period thus sees a certain diminution in the position of the actual high priest, whose tenure of office was precarious and who had no expectation of passing on his office to his son; but any loss of eminence in the individual is offset by the extension of eminence to a class within the priesthood. It is the period of high priests, rather than of the high priest: the title ceases to be that of an individual enjoying lifelong supremacy, and becomes a title of a group or class which includes primarily all individuals who have ever occupied the actual office of high priest and secondarily members of the various families that had supplied high priests, together with perhaps some that might be considered of equivalent rank. The actual high priest of the day, occupying for the moment a supreme position under government, could not look forward with confidence to being supreme to-morrow: but at least in stepping out of office he carried much prestige with him. He is, in the language of the Mishnah, if not משמש (acting, serving), yet שעבר, he who has passed—as we might say—the chair. The high priests, or the stock of the high priests, reproduce at this end of Jewish history the Jerusalem or Zadokite priests of six centuries previous; only the high priests have no interest in defining exclusive cultic rights, the difference is essentially that of rank, an inheritance in part at least from the period when the one high priest held a position that was substantially, even when not nominally, royal.

The dominance of the idea of rank is well seen in Josephus's description of himself in *The Life*, and also in his description of the election of the last high priest;[2] it is obvious that Josephus's grievance here is largely that the Zealots, by resorting to lot as a means of determining the high priesthood, robbed 'those families out of which the high priests used to be made' of what had come to be something like a claim to be a close corporation.[3]

[1] Josephus speaks of the illegality of Herod's actions (*Ant.* xv. $3^1$).

[2] *B. J.* iv. $3^{6,8}$.

[3] Of the twenty-seven nominated high priests from Herod downwards, twenty at least were drawn from four families.

from which the high priesthood must be selected. He is the more incensed because the lot fell on a mere rustic priest! 'By fortune the lot so fell as to demonstrate their (i. e. the Zealots') iniquity after the plainest manner, for it fell upon one whose name was Phineas, the son of Samuel, of the village of Aphthia. He was a man not only unworthy of the high priesthood, but that did not well know what the high priesthood was, such a mere rustic was he!' It would obviously be unwise and unfair to condemn this choice of the Zealots on the ground of Josephus's aristocratic prejudices, so rudely injured by this democratic election. Two features in Josephus are illuminating: firstly the very families whom he complains were robbed of the prescriptive right to the priesthood which they together claimed were families who had taken the place of the Hasmonaeans, and owed their position to nominators who, as Josephus elsewhere remarks, committed the illegality of deposing one high priest and appointing another, and who thus by acquiescing shared the responsibility for the illegality. Moreover, these families, by allowing the office to go backwards and forwards among three or four families, were themselves, no less than the Zealots with their method of lot, preventing the succession descending in a single family, which Josephus even in this passage asserts to be the law. Obviously the dominant idea had come to be that simple priesthood rendered eligible for high priesthood. Now this same point of view, as held by quite a different party from the rich families who had shared the high priesthood for the last century, comes out in the other noticeable feature of Josephus's narrative of the election of Phineas: this, viz. that the Zealots not only themselves elect by lot, but claim that was the ancient practice. Election by lot within a given circle most obviously implies the *eligibility* of all within that circle: the lot is a means of determining which individual within that circle is the chosen of God: and perhaps in spite of Josephus the lot might have led on the average to appointments on religious grounds at least as satisfactory as the nomination by entirely non-religious and non-Jewish authorities.

For on what kind of grounds were high priests nominated, and what kind of qualities did they actually possess? How do the actual occupants of the high priestly office stand related to the functions of the priesthood? Were they pre-eminent as

teachers? Were they pre-eminent in the administration of th cult?

As I suggested in the last lecture, the teaching function of th priesthood as a whole falls after the Exile into the backgroun And there is little evidence that the high priests were pre eminent for learning and teaching, or that, when not reachin office by succession, they were nominated with reference to suc gifts. How far the passage from Hecataeus attests such gifts is un certain: if it does it applies to the *hereditary* high priests of *c.* 30 B.C. What Hecataeus says is that 'the Jews have never ha a king, but committed the presidency of the people throughou to that one of the priests who was reputed to excel in wisdo and virtue; him they call the Chief Priest, and consider to b the messenger to them of the commands of God'.[1] But certainl the Menelauses and Jasons were not selected by the Seleuci government for such gifts or functions: and there is no reaso for thinking the Roman government later looked for suc qualities. The high priests were rather selected as men of sub stance and affairs: in the struggle for independence it is th military leaders who are promoted to the high priesthood; an unless feelings of jealousy intervene, as in the case of Herod' first appointment, it was, later, men of wealth and positio among the priests that were placed in the higher office. Dr Israel Abrahams[2] discovers in Philo 'a picture of the activity o the priests in teaching the law'; but the passage on which h relies scarcely bears the weight he would rest on it: what Phil does say is that in the synagogues 'the exposition of the Scrip tures was delivered by one of the priests who happened to b present or by one of the elders'; but the second of these classe is as important and significant as the first, and the priest come first, not as naturally the more learned person, but by precedence— a precedence already stated in the Mishnah and still valid to-day so that if a *kôhen* is present at the synagogue worship he read the lessons. The Mishnah is worth recalling: Horaioth, iii. 8 reads: 'A priest takes precedence of a Levite, a Levite of a (lay Israelite, an Israelite of a Mamzer, a Mamzer of a Nathin, a Nathi of a proselyte, and a proselyte of a freed slave. When does thi

[1] In Diodorous Siculus, *Bibliotheca*, xl. 3, 5 (ed. Muller, p. 580) quoted b Photius, p. 542 f., and Smith, *Jerusalem*, i. 389.

[2] *Notes*, p. 3.

precedence hold good? When other things are equal: but if a Mamzer is wise in the Law (תלמיד חכם) and a high priest (ignorant as) a common person (עם הארץ), the Mamzer learned in the Law has precedence of an ignorant high priest.'

The passage is interesting as, correctly if my main contention is right, showing the remembrance of the priestly pre-eminence being primarily a matter of rank, and also as showing how, from the standpoint of the Pharisaic ideal, this rank required qualification. But it is not mere rhetoric; such a thing as a high priest unlearned in the Law does not seem to have been unknown in the last years of the Temple. As men of wealth and position, many of the members of the high priestly families were doubtless cultivated men, learned in the wisdom of the world: of such Josephus may be taken as a conspicuous if not a typical example. But if the Mishnah at all events preserves a not wholly distorted picture, even the high priest was not always so learned in the Law as to be able to do unprompted his own duty, not to speak of instructing others. 'Seven days before the Day of Atonement,' we read in Yoma $1^{3f.}$, 'some of the elders of Beth-Din were given to the high priest (to look after him): they read the lesson for the day to him and said, Sir High Priest, read thou with thy mouth: perhaps you have forgotten it or have never learnt it.' On the eve of the Day he was taken over the ground and the rites were rehearsed. Farther on ($^{6}$) we read: 'If the High Priest was wise, he expounded Scripture; and if not those learned in the Law (ת"ח) expounded it before him. If he was fluent in reading (the Scriptures), he read them: if not they were read to him. And what was read to him? Job, Ezra and Chronicles.' R. Zechariah b. Ḳ$^{e}$buṭal relates: 'I often read Daniel to him.'

Thus as the priests as a whole had ceased to discharge any conspicuous teaching function, so the high priest was not the chief authority on learning and instruction. The priests were differentiated from the Levites on the ground of peculiar ritual qualifications: was the high priest differentiated from the priests on similar grounds? The answer to this question is not quite simple. For one conspicuous ritual—that of the Day of Atonement—the high priest was alone competent; but it is probable that the Day of Atonement was established after the emergence of the high

priest. For the rest, in the first century A.D. at least, the high priest was accustomed to perform the ordinary priestly ritual at the three great annual festivals: he could do so also at other times at his pleasure; but in practice seems rarely to have exercised the option. So much for the high priest himself: but Dr. Bücheler has argued with considerable force that other priests of high position—the high priests in the larger sense of that term, e.g. the high priests who were present at the Crucifixion (Mt. $27^{41}$, Mk. $15^{31}$) at the time when the ordinary priests were busy with the Paschal offerings—took no part in the sacrificial ritual. And even at the great festivals, when the high priest did perform the sacrificial ritual, it is not this that seems to have created so great an impression as his appearance in all the pomp of his official dress. The priests, and with them the high priest, lived by the cultus, but the higher priests appear to have taken no unnecessary part in the actual discharge and labour of the cultus, nor to have been pre-eminently attached to it. With the fall of the Temple, the cultus ceased: and with this in large part the revenues of the priesthood. The priesthood survived and survives, for long such revenue as tithe was payable and paid: certain taboos were still observed. And some of these conditions still exist. But the high priesthood ceases with the cessation of the cultus; such even titular supremacy as was known subsequently passed to the Rabbanate and was thus associated with learning.

Whether the high priesthood is ever destined to be renewed is a question essentially bound up with the resumption of the cultus. If with free access to the sacred site in Jerusalem the cultus were restored, the ritual of the Day of Atonement would call for a high priesthood. But the probability of this is doubtful. The Hebrew monarchy passed away, but left its mark in the idea of constantly recurring power and the Messianic belief: the Hebrew high priesthood passed away as completely as the monarchy, but left no corresponding mark on the world of Jewish thought; for, curiously enough, if we seek for this kind of survival we find it rather in Christian theology, with its conception of the high priesthood of Christ, than in any Jewish institution or Jewish thought that survived the fall of the Temple, the cessation and the break-up of its personnel.

# XVIII

## THE FESTIVALS

THE Old Testament contains at least one festal calendar or list of recurring sacred days, for such alike in form and substance is Lev. 23. This chapter opens with a paragraph defining the divine origin of the festal cycle: 'And Yahweh said to Moses: Speak to the Israelites, and say to them: These are the appointed seasons of Yahweh, which you shall proclaim to be holy religious meetings, my appointed seasons.' The term מועד which (following Driver and White in the Polychrome Bible) I have rendered 'appointed season' is wider than our term 'feast' as commonly used; and it is therefore more accurately rendered 'appointed season' than, as in the R.V., 'set feast'; but for convenience's sake I shall continue to use the term 'festal calendar' rather than 'calendar of appointed seasons'.

The second paragraph of Lev. 23 (v. [3]) defines the seventh day of every week, the Sabbath, as holy. The fourth verse consists of what appears to be a second superscription: 'These are the appointed seasons of Yahweh, holy religious meetings which you shall proclaim in their appointed seasons.' It is a reasonable and commonly accepted theory that the first three verses of the chapter, which precede this second superscription, are a later addition and that the calendar in its present form began at v. [4]. Be that as it may, it is with v. [5], i.e. the verse that follows the second superscription, that the list of days according to the order of the months in which they occur is given. With one exception, all the appointed seasons are defined by the number of the day and of the month in which they severally occur: the one exception is the day that is described as falling fifty days after a particular Sabbath.

The days included in this festal calendar are as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14. i | (approximately April). | Passover. |
| 15. (–21), i. | ,, | Maṣṣoth. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 50 days after x in 15–21. i, i.e. x. iii. | (June). | Firstfruits. |
| 1. vii. | (Oct.) | Day of Remembrance, made by the blowing of horns. |
| 10. vii. | „ | Day of Atonement. |
| 15–21 + 22. vii. | „ | Feasts of Booths. |

These days number nineteen in all, and they are confined to three out of the twelve months—to the first, the third, and the seventh.

For the first of these days—Passover—no special form of observation is mentioned in the calendar. For the seven following days three regulations are recorded: (1) on all seven days *maṣṣoth*, unleavened cakes, which gave their name to the feast, were to be eaten; (2) on all seven days an offering made by fire was to be offered to Yahweh; (3) on the first and last day no *servile* work (מלאכת עבדה) was to be done (contrast כל מלאכה vv. 3 and 28 of the Sabbath and Day of Atonement).

In a separate paragraph introduced by a special introductory clause it is further provided that 'on the day following the sabbath' a sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest (עמר ראשית קצירכם, Lev. $23^{10}$) shall be waved before Yahweh, and that a male lamb shall be offered as a burnt-offering. From the position which this paragraph occupies it appears that the sabbath mentioned is a day falling between the 15th and 21st days of the first month; and in any case this interpretation has governed the practice of the Jews, who identify the day with the 16th of Nisan in particular (Abrahams, *Prayer Book*, cciii). Fifty days after the sabbath just referred to, and according to Jewish practice fifty days after the 15th of Nisan in particular (Abrahams, loc. cit.), i.e. in the first week of the third month, Sivan (approximately June), two loaves made of flour prepared from the newly-reaped corn were solemnly presented, together with certain animal offerings, to Yahweh. This single-day feast is called in a closely-related passage the Day of Firstfruits (יום הבכורים, Num. $28^{26}$), and the familiar Greek title of the festival, Pentecost, occurs already in Tob. $2^{1}$, i.e. it is considerably earlier than the Christian era.

The remaining sacred days fell in the seventh month as follows: On the first day the Day of Remembrance made by the

blowing of horns, on the tenth day the Day of Atonement, on the fifteenth to the twenty-second the Feast of Booths: on all these days fire-offerings were presented to Yahweh, on the first, fifteenth, and twenty-second of the month all servile work was forbidden; on the tenth work of all kinds was forbidden.

The calendar closes with a colophon (vv. 37, 38): 'These are the appointed seasons of Yahweh, which you shall proclaim to be holy religious meetings, that you may bring offerings made by fire to Yahweh, burnt-offerings and cereal-offerings, slain-offerings and drink-offerings, each on its own day: besides the Sabbaths of Yahweh, and in addition to your gifts, and all the vows and free-will offerings which you give to Yahweh'.

*After* this colophon occurs a paragraph which by its very position shows itself to be no original part of the calendar, in which further directions for the festival of the seventh month are given.

Though in Lev. 23 the form of a calendar with a superscription and a colophon is well maintained, it is probable, not to say certain, that the chapter contains different literary elements, and that with a calendar defining the season of the feasts by the number of the month and the day have been combined passages from a different source which defined the festivals by reference to the agricultural processes of the year—the commencement and completion of the corn-harvest and the conclusion of all agricultural operations with the ingathering in autumn. These passages (vv. 9-12, 15-20, 22 and, after the colophon, vv. 39-43) are generally assigned to the Law of Holiness, the calendar to P.

The same calendar that, combined with the additions just referred to, survives in Lev. 23, also *underlies* another section of what belongs in the widest sense of that term to the Priestly Source of the Hexateuch. This section (Num. 28, 29) is in *form* not a calendar of feasts, but a table of the special offerings which were required on certain days of the year in addition to the offering presented regularly every morning and evening. Since the feasts, as Lev. 23 points out without (except in the parts derived from H) specifying quantities, were marked by special offerings, this table of quantities in Num. 28, 29 of necessity is, though not in form yet in substance, a festal calendar; or at least in substance it includes such a calendar. The days specified in Num. 28, 29 are the same as in Lev. 23[4ff.] with the addition of

the Sabbaths and of the eleven other new moons as well as that of the seventh month. It gives, therefore, apart from the Sabbaths, twenty-nine days in the year marked by special offerings; it mentions in all thirty days, but one of these is the fourteenth of Nisan, Passover, for which no special public offering is enjoined. The mention[1] of the Passover in Num. 28, 29 may indeed be due to amplification from Lev. 23, and perhaps in one or two other details these largely parallel sections have been glossed from one another.

Elsewhere in the O. T., i.e. outside the Priestly Code, we have nothing that is like Lev. 23, both in form and substance a festal calendar; but there are several passages that imply the existence of a yearly cycle of festivals. Most nearly akin in one respect at least to the festival calendar of the priestly calendar is a section of the Book of Ezekiel $45^{18-25}$ ($+ 46^{1-15}$): for here as in P the times of the festivals are determined by the number of the month and of the day. But in Ezekiel as in Num. 28 and 29 the proper quantities of offerings for various occasions (with some other ritual details) rather than the presentation of recurring yearly sacred seasons *in the order of their sequence* is the main subject determining the disposition of the sections; in Ezekiel as in Num. 28 and 29 the quantities of the daily offering, the Sabbath offerings, and the new moon offerings are included as well as the offerings for the less frequently recurring festivals.

In the festal calendar of Lev. 23 there are two months, the first and the seventh, that are pre-eminently festal months: in them, apart from Sabbaths and new moons, *all* the festal days but one of the year occur; i.e. eight such days occur in the first month, one in the third, and ten in the seventh. This festal balance of the year, as we may term it, is even more marked and absolutely even in Ezekiel: eight festal days occur in the first month, eight festal days in the seventh month, and none in any other. Moreover, it is obvious from the disposition of the matter that Ezekiel lays stress on this balance: he abandons or fails to use the calendral sequence in order twice over to draw attention to the symmetry of the first and seventh months: the corresponding single days in each of these two months is dealt with first, and then the corresponding seven day feasts: 'In the

[1] Ct. Ez. $45^{21}$.

first month, on the first day of the month ye shall take a bullock without blemish, and unsin the sanctuary. . . . *So* shall ye[1] do also in the[2] seventh month, on the first day of the month' ($45^{18, 20}$): and again 'in the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month . . . the prince shall provide a bullock as a sin-offering, and during the seven days of the feast he shall provide daily, as a burnt-offering to Yahweh, seven bullocks, &c. . . . in the seventh month, on the fifteenth day of the month . . . he shall provide *in like manner* for seven days, &c.' ($45^{21-23, 25}$).

It is of course to be remembered that Ezekiel's calendar is part of a prophetic or ideal constitution: we have no evidence and it is improbable that the festal cycle exactly as Ezekiel presents it was ever observed in practice, though in its positive details it is largely based on ancient and in agreement with subsequent practice. It is at variance both with the actual past and the actual future in its elimination of the single day mid-summer festival. It is at variance with the Priestly Code in attributing a special character beyond that of all other new moons except that of the seventh month to the first day of the first month, and in attributing *no* special festal character to the tenth day of the seventh month. As compared with P it contains *two* Days of Atonement (though the term is not used) instead of one; and it makes the length of the longer festivals of the first and seventh months seven days instead of eight. On the relative antiquity of these calendars and of some of these varying observances I shall have another opportunity of speaking. Meantime, I note one point of agreement which is particularly noticeable inasmuch as it prevents the symmetry so obvious in Ezekiel's festal cycle being absolute: the spring festival commences on the *fourteenth*, the autumn on the fifteenth day of the month.[3]

The command to observe what we may safely infer was even then a long established annual cycle of feasts, appears in the Book of the Covenant: 'Three times in the year shalt thou keep a feast (pilgrimage, חגג) unto me: the feast of unleavened cakes

[1 Reading plural with the LXX.]

[2 So LXX: MT 'in the seventh in the month'.

[3 Bertholet, *KHC* Ezekiel, p. 235, after Smend emends fourteenth to fifteenth of the first month.

shalt thou observe; and the feast of harvest, the firstfruits of thy work, of that which thou sowest in thy field; and the feast of the ingathering at the end[1] (outgoing, בצאת) of the year, when thou gatherest in thy work out of the field' (Ex. $23^{14f.}$). The law appears with some difference of terminology in Ex. $34^{18, 22f.}$ (J): 'The feast (חג) of unleavened cakes shalt thou observe. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes . . . . And thou shalt hold thee (תעשה) the feast of Weeks, the firstfruits of wheat-harvest; and the feast of ingathering at the year's circuit. Three times in the year shall all thy males see Yahweh's face.'

Both in Ex. $23^{15}$ and $34^{18}$, but in what are commonly regarded as later additions to the laws, the month in which the feast of unleavened cakes is to take place is defined as the month Abib; but even for that feast no particular days in the month are defined; and for the other two feasts neither day nor month is defined.

Dt. 16 is a characteristic expansion of the laws just cited from Ex. 23 and 34: like those laws it enjoins three feasts, calls these feasts or at least two of them[2] חג, and defines none of them as falling on a precise day in the calendar. But the *month* in which the first of the three feasts is to be kept is emphasized in the very first words of the law: 'Observe the month Abib and hold Passover unto Yahweh thy Lord.' For the rest the facts here, as in Ex. 23 and 34, are defined by reference to agricultural operations which occur indeed about the same time in successive years, but yet with some variation. The Feast of Weeks is fixed at seven weeks after the sickle is first used on the standing crops; the Feast of Booths, as the last of the Feasts is here called, is to be kept 'when thou gatherest in from thy threshing floor and from thy vat'[3] i. e. at the time of that ingathering which gave the feast the alternative names which it bears in Ex. As in Ex. 34 so in Dt. the spring feast lasts seven days; and in Dt. the same duration is assigned to the autumn feast: the duration of the intermediate feast is not specified.

Since the laws of Ex. 23 and 34 and of Dt. refer to the duty of celebrating *haggim* or pilgrimage festivals, there is no room for reference in them to מועדים, appointed seasons such as the

[1 But cp. p. 300 f. Dr. Gray would probably have corrected this if he had revised the MS. himself.]

[2 vv.[10], [13]: note that v.[7] implies that 'unleavened cakes' was also a 'pilgrimage feast'.

[3 v.[13].]

Sabbaths and new moons which were not חגים; but for the observance of the 'set seasons' just mentioned we have other early evidence: e.g. Am. $8^5$ implies that these were days of cessation from business: 'When,' he represents the greedy merchants as saying, 'when will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat?' and Hos. $2^{13}$ [E.V.$^{11}$] cites both new moon and Sabbath as festal seasons though of a different species from the pilgrimage festivals of Ex. 23 and Dt. 16: 'I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her pilgrimage feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths.'[1] Like new moon and Sabbath, the Day of Atonement and New Year's Day, which figure among the appointed seasons of Lev. 23, would have had no place in the laws of pilgrimage festivals; but of these days we have at least no direct early testimony.

The festal calendar of Lev. 23 remains in force to the present day: since the destruction of the Temple the presentation of the additional sacrifices required for these feasts has become impossible: but with the modifications thus necessitated, viz. the use of *additional prayer* in lieu of additional sacrifices, the Sabbaths, the new moons, the Passover, and seven days of unleavened bread, the Day of Firstfruits, the beginning of the year in the seventh month are all still observed. But these festivals of the law, as we may call them, do not exhaust the festivals of modern Judaism, much less the festivals of, let us say, the first century A.D., as we may see from yet another festival calendar which, though later in origin than the completion of the law and perhaps later also than the completion of the whole Jewish Canon, is yet of great antiquity.

This festal calendar is the Megillath Ta'anith, the Roll of Fasting, so named on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle because it consists of a list of days on which fasting was forbidden. It is written in Aramaic, and at a later date was provided with a Hebrew Commentary. The (Aramaic) Roll is referred to in the Mishnah: in Ta'an. $2^{14}$ we read כל הכתוב במגלת תענית דלא למספד לפניו אסור לאחריו מותר—Mourning is forbidden on the day preceding every day which is noted in the Roll of Fasting as one on which there is to be no mourning: but it is permitted on the

[1] The following clause וכל מועדה looks like a gloss; if not, it is a summarizing clause 'even all her appointed seasons'.

day following. But inasmuch as this dictum is challenged and R. Jose's divergent opinion is cited, i.e. the effect of the provisions of the Roll of Fasting had become a subject of controversy, the Roll and the festal calendar which it contains must be considerably earlier than A.D. 200. If, however, טיריון and יום טוריינו as the twelfth of Adar is called, really be *Trajan's* day, and still more if the entry in reference to the twenty-eighth of Adar refers to a decree of Antoninus Pius withdrawing Hadrian's prohibition of circumcision, then certain entries at least in the Roll cannot be much earlier than A.D. 150.[1] But a document of this kind is particularly open to additions, and it is probable that it existed in the main before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 though perhaps not long before (Dalman,[2] A.D. 66–70), and the Talmudic tradition (Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* ed. 2 iii. 356) which associates the Roll with Eleazar b. Ananiah may be correct. This Eleazar was of a high priestly family, of the School of Shammai, and the soul of the revolutionary party prior to A.D. 70 (Graetz iii. 340). The festivals themselves are of course more ancient than the recording of them in the Roll, and some of them originated at least as early as the second century B.C.[3] With the exception of two, these festivals ceased to be observed after the third century A.D. (J. Ta'an 66a, J. Meg. 70d, J. Ned. 40d, Rosh Hash. 18b).

These remarks may suffice as an introduction to what needs to be said of the contents of the Roll itself and of the extent and character of this Jewish festal calendar. A complete discussion would involve us in much uncertain interpretation, but that is unnecessary for the more general appreciation of this document such as will serve our present purpose.

The calendar opens with this superscription: 'These are the days on which fasting is forbidden and on some of which mourning also is forbidden': then follows a list of about forty-four days arranged in the order of the months, beginning with Nisan, with in most cases a brief reference to the origin or character of

[1] Trajan, 98–117, Ant. P. 138–61.

[2] *Grammatik des Judisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, p. 7.

[3] Cp. Judith 8[6]: 'And she fasted all the days of her widowhood, save the eve of the Sabbath, and the Sabbath, and the eve of the new moon, and the new moon, and the feasts (*ἑορταί* may be מועדים as well as חגים—against Cowley in Barth), and the joyful days (*χαρμοσυνῶν*) of the house of Israel.' Contrast Hos. 2[13] [E.V.[11]].

the festival and, in the case of the days when mourning as well as fasting was forbidden, of the clause 'No mourning'. The section containing the festivals of Adar may suffice as an illustration of the style and character of the calendar.[1]

We may note first that certain days of rejoicing and days on which a public fast might not be decreed,[2] are absent from this calendar: viz. the days of Pentecost and the autumn festival of Booths and all new moons except that of Nisan; moreover the days of the spring festival are introduced simply as defining the close of a period of rejoicing that begins before the feast: 'From the eighth to the end of the set season (מועדא), the pilgrimage-festival was restored. No mourning.'

The calendar is thus seen to be really a *supplement* to the festal calendar of Scripture (Lev. 23 and Num. 28, 29). It is in reality a list of days additional to those listed in the law on which some though not all the observances characteristic of the festivals mentioned in the law were to be kept. As compared with the holidays and festivals of the law, these may be called semi-holidays or semi-festivals (Graetz, *Halbfeiertage*).

If we now consider the outstanding positive features of this calendar, we must place foremost this fact: the occasions or origins of nearly all these festivals are professedly historical; they were days of rejoicing because in some particular year on these several days in the past something had happened which these festal observances were intended to celebrate. In all some thirty-five historical events, many of them Jewish victories, were thus commemorated. As Josephus says of one of them (*Ant.* xii. 10[7]): *τὴν δὲ νίκην συνέβη γενέσθαι ταύτην τῇ τρισκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνός, τοῦ λεγομένου παρὰ μὲν Ἰουδαίοις Ἀδάρ . . . Ἄγουσιν δ' ἐν τούτῳ τὰ νικητήρια κατὰ πᾶν ἔτος. καὶ ἑορτὴν νομίζουσι τὴν ἡμέραν*—On this day every year they celebrate the rites of victory, and as a festival do they regard the day. The day of which Josephus here speaks is the day on which the Jews defeated Nicanor, the second in command of the army of Antiochus. In 1 Macc. $7^{43, 48 f.}$ the occasion and the *institution*

[1 See Appendix III.]

[2] Cp. Ta'an. ii. 10 which excludes new moons, Ḥ[a]nukkah and Purim—Maṣṣoth, Pentecost, and Booths fall in the period when the fasts in question could not be called for.

of the festival to commemorate it are recorded: 'And on the thirteenth day of the month Adar the armies joined battle, and Nicanor's army was discomfited, and he himself was the first to fall in the battle . . . And the people was exceeding glad and they kept that day as a day of great gladness. And they ordained to keep this day year by year on the thirteenth of Adar.' And similarly in 2 Macc. $15^{36}$ the Jews are said to have decided that the thirteenth day of the twelfth month was never to pass *ἀπαρασήμαντον*, but that it should be *ἐπίσημον*. In the Meg. Ta'anith the thirteenth day of Adar is defined as יום נקנר Nicanor's day, and there is no difficulty in identifying the festival so called with the day and observance recorded in the two books of Maccabees and in Josephus. Moreover, the event which gave its name to the day was a sufficiently striking victory to evoke a popular commemoration in succeeding years.

Equally unmistakable is the historical event celebrated on the twenty-fifth of Chisleu (Dec.) and the following days: the entry in the calendar is brief: 'On the twenty-fifth day Hanukkah: eight days: no mourning': this is a festival in commemoration of the dedication of the new altar that replaced the altar that had been profaned by the Greeks: on the twenty-fifth of Chisleu in the year 165 'sacrifice according to the law' was first offered on this altar: and Judas Maccabaeus and the whole congregation 'ordained that the days of the dedication of the altar should be kept in their seasons from year to year by the space of eight days from the five and twentieth day of the month Chisleu'.[1]

'The days of Purim' on the fourteenth and fifteenth of Adar are obviously the festival described in Esther $9^{17\ 19}$ and were doubtless to the compiler of the festal calendar a commemoration of historical events; but whether the story in Esther is true and whether Purim really originated in an historical event are very open questions.

The 'Day of Mt. Gerizim' on the twenty-first of Chisleu is reasonably supposed to perpetuate the memory of the capture of Gerizim by John Hyrcanus as related by Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. $9^{1}$; and one of the two days, seventh Iyyar and seventh Elul, entered in the calendar as 'the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem' may refer to the completion of Nehemiah's labours on the

[1 1 Macc. $4^{59}$.]

ruined walls (Neh. $6^{15}$,$^{''}12^{27}$). But other entries are ambiguous and have been differently explained or are altogether obscure: such are 'on the twenty-seventh of Iyyar the tax-gatherers (כלילאי) were removed from Jerusalem', a record which is repeated on the twenty-fifth of Sivan with the substitution of דימוסנאי for כלילאי; 'on the fourteenth of Tammuz the book of the decrees ceased'; 'on the twenty-second of Elul we returned to slay the ungodly'. Two days—the seventh of Chisleu and the second of Shebat—are simply noted as יום טב i. e. festival.

But while the exact occasions of the festivals in many cases are not clear, it is probable that they were mostly events in or after the Maccabean period; for example, the exact reference of the entry 'On the seventeenth of Elul the Romans were removed from Judea and Jerusalem' is not obvious, but it is certainly to some event in the post-Maccabean period.

Apparently, then, many of these festivals celebrate events which had made a marked impression on the popular mind; they arose, it would seem, to satisfy a popular demand. But some look more as though they were imposed from above—by the scribes. For example, the first day (or days) of Nisan is defined as that on which איתיקם תמידא—the daily offering was instituted. Now in Ex. $40^{17-29}$ it is stated that on the first day of the first month (i. e. Nisan) Moses set up the altar of burnt-offering and offered on it the first burnt-offering and meal-offering: i. e. on the first of Nisan, according to the view of P which dominated the post-exilic period, the Jewish sacrificial system and with it the daily offering began. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion (Dalman) that this Biblical date suggested the addition to an already long list of memorial festivals of this memorial of the commencement of the sacrificial system: but such a suggestion would certainly have come first not to the populace but to the scribes. That this festival was not of popular origin would also follow if we adopted Graetz's[1] alternative view that the festival celebrates a stage in the Pharisaic controversy with the Sadducees.

But we may set over against this probably scribal festival one that was pretty certainly popular in origin though it was not a memorial of victory: 'On the twentieth of Adar the people

[1] Op. cit. ed. 2. iii. 121 f.

fasted for rain and it came down for them': the commemoration is of some unusually severe drought and a sudden end to it in what appeared an almost miraculous response to the people's prayer and fasting.[1] A different but similar occasion is also probably implied in the briefer note on the festival of the eighth and ninth of Adar: day of horn-blowing for rain.

Perhaps the only festival in the roll that is not historical in origin and character, but institutional, is the fourteenth of Iyyar, which is described as 'The slaughter of the Little Passover. No mourning.' This is that second or supplementary Passover which might be observed exactly one month after the Passover proper by those who were prevented from keeping Passover on the fourteenth of Nisan through defilement or absence on a journey. The institution of this day is recorded in the law (Num. $9^{6-14}$), but the day itself does not stand in the festal calendar of Lev. 23.

One other entry looks at first sight at least like an institutional festival: 'On the fifteenth of Ab the time of wood for the priests (דמן אעי כהניא).' The festival in question must be the same that is referred to by Josephus, though he implies that the date was the fourteenth not the fifteenth of Ab. In *B. J.* ii. $17^{6}$ he writes, 'Now the next day being the festival (ἑορτή) of the Ξυλοφόρια, on which it was the custom for *all* to bring wood for the altar.' If Josephus and the Meg. Ta'anith stood alone we should perhaps most naturally infer that this festival was not historical but institutional in character. But when we turn to the Mishnah (Ta'an. $4^{5}$) we find that different families delivered wood on *nine* different days in the year. Graetz[2] therefore argued that the definition in the Roll of Fasting of the fifteenth of Ab as 'the day of wood for the priests' was misleading, since there was not merely one day but nine such days and of the eight others the Roll says nothing. But while 'wood for the altar', as Josephus calls it, might no doubt be expressed in Aramaic by an objective genitive phrase 'wood of (i. e. destined for) the priests' and therefore for the altar, it is not necessary to take the genitive phrase used in the Roll in this sense; the genitive may be subjective and mean 'wood of the priests', i. e. wood presented not to but by the priests. There the Roll and the Mishnah are in

[1] Cp. Jos. *Ant.* xiv. $2^{1}$.

[2] Op. cit. iii. 122 f.

agreement. The section of the Mishnah opens with the exact equivalent in Hebrew of the Aramaic phrase in the Roll זמן עצי כהנים והעם and here the genitive must be subjective.[1] The time of the wood of, i. e. presented by, the priests and the people was nine (separate days). Then follow the days with the families presenting on them severally: 'On the first of Nisan the children of Arak of the tribe of Judah; on the twentieth of Tammuz the children of David of the tribe of Judah' and so on; it is only necessary to cite further the statement with reference to the fifteenth of Ab: this runs, 'On the fifteenth of Ab the children of Lattu of the tribe of Judah and with them the priests and the Levites and everyone who is uncertain to what tribe he belongs'.[2] The fifteenth of Ab is the *only* day on which the Mishnah mentions the priests as presenting wood: as the most important class presenting on that day they might well give rise to such an abbreviated title as that in the Roll would then be: Day on which the priests presented wood.

But even so, does the festal character of the fifteenth of Ab really derive from the fact that the priests on that day presented wood for the altar? Another somewhat remarkable passage in the same Mishnah tract casts doubt on this: in Ta'an. 4[8] we read: 'Rabbi Simeon the son of Gamaliel said, There are no such high holidays (ימים טובים in Israel as the fifteenth of Ab and the Day of Atonement; for on those days the daughters of Jerusalem go forth clad in white garments—all of the garments are borrowed so that she who has none of her own may not be put to shame, and all of them must be washed. Thus the daughters of Jerusalem go forth and dance in the vineyards. And what said they: Young man lift up now thine eyes and see what thou wilt choose for thyself—(i. e. whom thou wilt choose for a wife) set not thine eyes on the figure (בנוי), set thine eyes on the family: Grace is deceitful and beauty a vain thing, but she that feareth the Lord shall be praised; and the Scripture (or "the young man"?) also says, Give to her of the fruit of her hands and her deeds shall be praised in the gates'.[3]

[1] In Mishnah, Meg. 1[7] זמן עצי כהנים it might of course be objective, and as small villages are concerned perhaps most naturally so.

[2] Also בני גבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות.

[3] On the passage cp. Cheyne *E. Bi.* 388, where it is suggested it took place

Now it is clear that this ceremony, which is distinctly of a *universal* festal character, has nothing whatever to do with the fact that certain *limited* classes on this day made their presentation of wood for the altar. Nor is it easily explained even though we adopt Graetz's alternative theory, viz. that the fifteenth of Ab is not an institutional festival, but a commemoration of the fact that on this day certain families at the peril of their lives loyally presented the wood, though a king, whom Graetz is inclined to identify with Alexander Jannaeus, had forbidden the wood to be presented. Nor indeed are the ceremonies described in the last cited Mishnah—the maidens of Jerusalem dancing in the vineyards, clad in white vesture, not their own, and their thoughts set on matrimony—to be explained as an historical commemoration of any of the events which the Gemara rather fantastically connects with this festival, such as e. g. that on the fifteenth of Ab the last man of the rebellious generation in the wilderness died. It is tolerably obvious that we have to do here with a festival of popular origin and customs closely related with those which exist in various parts and survive in an attenuated form even to our own time in connexion with wishing wells and the like.

Thus an old popular holiday on the fifteenth of Ab, on which customs of great antiquity were performed, receives in the calendar a name from an ecclesiastical function of relatively recent date. It is possible, as we have already seen, that another of the festivals of the calendar, viz. Purim, is also popular rather than historical in origin; and the same may be true of at least one other of the festivals: but this we can better discuss in connexion with a synthetic survey of the calendar which we have so far chiefly considered in separation. When every possibility is allowed for, however, the great majority of the festivals recorded in the Roll of Fasting are commemorations of historical events.

in the evening of the 'Great Day of Atonement after the ritual of the day was complete': but this would be the day after the Day (the eleventh of Tishri), *E.Bi.* 689 (where הוא is interpreted of the young man, and the dancing is inferred to have been alternate), *E.Bi.* 1000. Gemara (cited in Jeremias) more easily accounts for the festivity on the Day of Atonement ('a day of pardon and remission') than on the fifteenth of Ab.

# XIX

## NEW YEAR'S DAY AND SOME OTHER FESTIVALS

When we consider the various days of festival or observance in the calendars or related passages of the O.T. and in the post-Biblical Roll of Fasting, it quickly, if not immediately, becomes clear that three considerations actually determined the occasion, or were at times held to have determined the occasion, of these festivals: some were determined by agricultural, some by astronomical, and some by historical considerations. It is not impossible that the origin of the Passover, unlike the rest, was pastoral, and at all events this festival is in the O.T. itself traced back to a pastoral period in the history of the people. But the observance of the Passover was within the historical period always associated most closely with the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and we may for the time being leave the origin of the Passover out of account and consider the relative importance of agriculture, astronomy, and history in the Jewish festal calendars.

The large influence of history in determining the festal days of the Jews is obvious in the Roll of Fasting; the influence of agriculture has left its traces on the names of the most prominent ancient festivals, the Feast of Harvest and the Feast of Ingathering; the influence of astronomy in the also ancient observance of the new moons. But not a few of the days came to wear a double character: most clearly is this so with the two great agricultural feasts which were made to wear also the character of historical commemoration.

Beyond the observance of the new moons, how much in Jewish festal rites was affected by astronomy? Since the Hebrew months were lunar months and began when the new moon first became visible, full moon fell on the average on the fifteenth day of the month. Now the great festal weeks of the year according to Lev. 23, which has governed all subsequent Jewish practice,

began at or about the full moon—the combined festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread began in the afternoon of the fourteenth of Nisan (say April), and the first day of the Feast of Booths on the fifteenth of Tishri, i.e. after the sundown with which the fourteenth of Tishri closed (say October).[1] On the other hand, the Day of Atonement falls on the tenth day of the month, i.e. when the moon is about half-way between its first quarter and the full—an insignificant phase. Moreover, the Day of Firstfruits, according to the traditional reckoning of the ambiguous datum '50 days from the Sabbath' (undefined), fell at the end of the first week of the third month—say about the moon's first quarter—but even if it fell exactly on the first quarter, it fell at a not very significant phase.[2] But curiously enough, as against this traditional theory which has prevailed with some insignificant variations of practice, a certain school of Jewish thought in the first century B. C. gave to Pentecost the same lunar character as the first days of the feasts of Passover-Unleavened Bread and Ingathering, i.e., however the calculation was managed, the Feast of Pentecost was fixed on the fifteenth day of the third month, and therefore at the full moon. This is the theory—whether practice ever corresponded to it is another question—of the Book of Jubilees: Abram, we are told, celebrated the Feast of the Firstfruits of the grain harvest in the third month, *in the middle of the month* ($15^1$), and in the third month, in the middle of the month on the Festival of the Firstfruits of harvest, was Isaac born ($16^{13}$): and Jacob starting out on the new moon of the third month, after seven days' journey offered sacrifice, then remained seven days, and then offered the harvest festival of the Firstfruits, and then on the sixteenth the Lord appeared to him.[3]

From the certain fact that in Lev. 23 all new moons in a year and two of the full moons were festal days we may look before and after at other certain facts and consider their significance.

[1] Philo comments on Unleavened Bread and Booths beginning at the full moon. *De Septen* 19, 24 (Mangey ii. 293, 297); Cohu v. $105^{1,8}$, $118^{1,9}$.

[2] Yet the first quarter attracted attention as the day when the 'horns disappeared'. Creation Tablets v. 17; Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 33.

[3] Middle of the month in Jubilees: fifth month Abraham journeys ($16^{11}$), sixth month Sarah conceives Isaac.

In Ezekiel, in addition to the generally festal character of all new moons, there are four days in the year of exceptional solemnity, the first and fourteenth days of the first month, the first and fifteenth days of the seventh month, that is two days of new moon and two days when the moon is at or on the point of becoming full. The contrast with Lev. 23 is striking: for *all* the solemn annual days in Ezekiel fall either at new or at full moon, but in Leviticus we have the intrusion certainly of the Day of Atonement, probably of the Feast of Weeks, on days of no lunar significance. If it could be shown that prior to the time of Ezekiel the spring and autumn festivals began at the full moon, but the Feast of Harvest neither at new nor full moon, then the omission of the Feast of Harvest from Ezekiel's cycle, which is in any case remarkable, might be attributed to its lunar insignificance.

Neither in Dt. nor in Ex. 23 and 34 is there any reference either to the day of the month or to the state of the moon at the festivals: what inferences have been drawn or can be drawn from this fact had better be considered later.

But we come to facts again when we turn to the Roll of Fasting. The Roll contains about thirty-five distinct festivals, i. e. thirty-five days of single day festivals or in one or two cases initial days of longer festivals. Almost without exception these festivals purport, as we have seen, to be historical festivals—anniversaries of historical events. Such a claim need not necessarily be right, and festivals which came to be regarded as historical anniversaries might in origin be astronomical; but an examination of the days concerned shows at least that they cannot in many cases have had lunar significance. The festivals are distributed over twenty different days of the month, the ten days not occurring as the sole or initial festal days in any month being the 4th, 5th, 6th, 10th, 11th, 18th, 19th, 26th, 29th, and 30th. Of course if the historical characters of the days were merely secondary, and the days all of them primarily lunar festivals, the festivals would occur exclusively on the 1st, 8th, 15th, and 22nd of the months; as a matter of fact two occur on the eighth day of a month, two on the fifteenth, two on the twenty-second, and one on the first—seven in all out of thirty-five on these four days; over against this set the fact that three occur on each of such

singularly insignificant days as the twenty-fifth and twenty-eighth, and two on the seventeenth and twenty-seventh, i. e. ten in all on four insignificant days as against seven on the four significant days. The one feature of the list that might at first suggest a certain lunar influence on comparison with other features is seen by itself to be inconclusive. I refer to the fact that there is a certain massing of festivals about the middle of the month, near if not actually at the full moon ; four of the festivals fall on the fourteenth, two as we have seen on the fifteenth. But one of those on the fourteenth is Little Passover institutional and not historical in character, and its date determined by the fourteenth day of the preceding month, being the date of Passover proper. This leaves us with five festivals on the fourteenth or fifteenth of a month, i.e. about the full moon, and this might seem a large enough number to be significant : but we also find five festivals on the two consecutive days which are of the most complete insignificance in reference to the moon, viz. on the twenty-seventh and the twenty-eighth. We can, therefore, only infer that any of the festivals falling on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the month were not primarily historical, if features in the observance of any of these days suggest it. Unfortunately we have little information as to the observance of any of these festivals beyond the fact that fasting and in some cases also mourning were forbidden on them. But Purim, which fell on the fourteenth and fifteenth of Adar, is an exception to the rule, and the manner of the observance of this festival strongly suggests and has convinced many investigators that it is not primarily historical in character. There is some suggestion that the same may be said of the fifteenth of Ab ; the origin traditionally assigned to it does not explain why the maidens clad in white vesture, not their own, went out to dance in the vineyards. It would be easier to find analogies for this in popular rites which elsewhere fall at particular seasons of the year or phases of the moon, or which at all events are not mere anniversaries of historical events.

So far we have considered only the influence of the moon on Hebrew festivals—certain in the case of the new moon festivals, probable in certain other festivals that fell at the full moon. But had the course of the sun any influence ? First and generally it is to be remarked here that the sun kept the various festivals,

including those that were of lunar significance, constant to their original seasons; whereas the Mohammedan year regards only the moon, so that the same festival in the course of thirty-three years moves round the entire cycle of seasons, occurring now at mid-summer, now in mid-winter, the Hebrew festival of Unleavened Bread, for example, from the earliest times to the present day has occurred in spring.

But there are two or three festivals that may be more particularly affected by the sun. Solar festivals occur especially at or about the equinoxes. Now in the festal calendar of Lev. 23, as in Ezekiel and in Jewish practice for the past 2,000 years, the Feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread falls on the new moon (or one of the two full moons) nearest to the spring equinox; and consequently the Feast of Ingathering or Booths, which took and takes place exactly six months afterwards, occurs at the full moon nearest the autumn equinox. Obviously we might have here an originally lunar feast attracted and attached to a particular full moon under solar influence, or an original solar feast displaced to a slight extent in most years from the exact time of the equinox under lunar influence. The fact, whether significant or not, is this, that the two principal and most ancient Hebrew festivals fall near the spring and autumn equinoxes respectively.

Of *solstitial* festivals the O.T. gives no trace. On the other hand the later festal calendar, the Roll of Fasting, contains a festival vying with the two ancient festivals of Unleavened Bread and Ingathering in respect of the length of its observances, which extend over eight days; and this festival, the Feast of the Dedication, fell at or about the winter solstice—beginning on the 25th of Chisleu, which corresponds roughly to December. There is no corresponding festival at or about the summer solstice, the festival of the 25th of Sivan (June) being confined to a single day. The 9th of Ab (August), the great Fast Day, is too far removed from midsummer to see in it a summer solstitial lament for the now shortening days. Otherwise the story cited in Lightfoot xii. 341 from Ekhah Rabbati might be treated as a development or use of the motive of the antithetical characters of the two solstices. It may also be pointed out that one or more festivals occur in the last week of six other months. The mere fact, then, that the Feast of Dedication fell on the 25th of

Chisleu and the following days does not point strongly to its occurrence at the time of the winter solstice being, astronomically regarded, anything more than an accident. If we are to infer that the concurrence of the festival and the solstice is more than an accident and that the great festival of Chisleu existed as a solstitial festival before the character of an historical commemoration was superimposed upon it, this must be on the ground of the nature of the celebration. The feature of the celebration that suggests a connexion with the winter solstice is, of course, the rite of 'kindling the lights', a feature prominent and distinctive enough to have given an alternative name to the festival: the name of the feast that suggests an historical origin—the Feast or Days of Dedication—is as old as 1 Macc. ($4^{59}$ *ἡμέραι ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*), is familiar from the references to it in the Gospel of St. John (*τὰ ἐγκαίνια*, $10^{22}$), and remains in use to the present day; the alternative title, 'Lights', is vouched for by Josephus, who says 'from that time (viz. 165 B.C.) until now we celebrate the feast, calling it *Φῶτα*.'[1]

Unfortunately Josephus says nothing of the ritual of the 'Lights'; and curiously enough offers a merely conjectural explanation of the name; the feast was so termed, he says, 'because, I suppose, of this liberty (*ἐξουσία*) beyond our hopes had appeared to us'. The explanation is obviously forced, and it need be mentioned merely as a curiosity of exegesis that Grimm in his commentary on 1 Macc. $4^{59}$ suggested that the custom of kindling the lights at the festival arose from the name!

Neither the first nor the second book of the Maccabees nor Josephus, our earliest authorities for the origin of the feast, gives us any direct information as to the manner of its *annual* celebration. This we have to infer from their accounts of the *original* celebration. In this way we gather:

(1) That it was marked by sacrificial feasts, by sacrifices, that is to say, of which the people ate the flesh at a sacred meal. What 1 Macc. $4^{56}$ says of the original festival is that 'they kept the dedication of the altar eight days, and offered burnt offerings with gladness, and sacrificed a sacrifice of deliverance and praise.' The burnt-offerings here spoken of are not offerings special to

[1] *Ant.* xii. $7^{7}$.

the feast, but the burnt-offerings of the daily offering together with the additional offerings for the Sabbath and new moon which fell within the days of the festival; these, though in a certain sense a matter of course, are especially mentioned, because in the interval between the profanation of the altar by Antiochus and the dedication of the new altar which was now being celebrated the daily offering of burnt-offerings had been interrupted. This point of view is more clearly put in 2 Macc. 10[1ff.] where we read, 'Now Maccabaeus and his followers... after cleansing the sanctuary erected another altar of sacrifice, and striking fire out of flints they offered sacrifice after a lapse of two years with incense, lamps, and the presentation of shewbread.' Josephus refers still indirectly, but more explicitly, to what was the distinctive sacrificial character of the days of the annual celebration—viz. the multiplication of animals sacrificed in peace-offerings for the enjoyment of the people: what he says is that 'Judas with his fellow citizens celebrated with a feast the restoration of the Temple sacrifices (*τῆς περὶ τὸν ναὸν θυσίας*), omitting no form of pleasure and feasting them (*κατευώχων αὐτούς*) on the sacrifices which were many and splendid.'[1] This point is of some interest, for it differentiates the Feast of Dedication in respect of sacrificial customs from the two other festal weeks of the year, those viz. of Unleavened Bread and Tabernacles. At those festivals the law of Num. 28, 29 provided that additional

[1] Loc. cit. A survival of this when sacrifices of peace-offerings had ceased to be possible may be seen in the custom of providing during the festival more sumptuous meals than at other times: especially on the Sunday that fell during the festival it was necessary to provide the costliest fare, even though it was necessary in order to do so to sell one's land or inheritance. Schröder, *Gebräuche des Talmudisch-Rabbinischen Judenthums*, p. 98 f. Cp. Abraham Ibn Ezra's Table Hymn:

Fat dainty foods and fine,
And bread baked well and white,
With pigeons and red wine
On this Sabbath Chanukah night.

Your chattels and your lands
Go and pledge, go and sell,
Put money in your hands
To feast Chanukah, &c.

Abrahams, *Jewish Life*, 135.

offerings should be made of victims that were not to be eaten by the people, but were to be offered as burnt-offerings or sin-offerings. Of *such* additional offerings at the Feast of Dedication we have no evidence, but the reverse. After the destruction of the Temple, in lieu of the additional sacrifices for the festivals mentioned in Lev. 23 called technically Musaph, an additional service of prayers was introduced in the daily liturgy and was also called the Musaph. But the Jewish liturgy has never recognized a Musaph for the Feast of Dedication.

(2) In 2 Macc. 10[7] the description of the original festival closes with these words: 'So bearing θύρσοι and fair boughs and palms, they offered praise,' &c.

(3) The name 'Lights' which, according to Josephus, attached to the feast, suggests that the feast was already marked by some such ritual of lights as has certainly marked it since Talmudic times. According to the rubric of the Jewish Prayer Book 'The Feast of Dedication lasts eight days. On the first evening a light is kindled, the number of lights being increased by one on each consecutive evening.' Before the kindling of lights the following blessing is said, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and commanded us to kindle the light of Ḥanukkah. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who wroughtest miracles for our Fathers in the days of old, at this season.'[1] By the age of the Talmud the ritual of the lights had already given rise to a good deal of casuistry, e. g. if a house had two doors, must a light be placed at each (*Shab.* 23a)? Is the duty of pronouncing a blessing on the light incumbent on the person who kindles the light only, or also on those who see it? How many times must the blessing be said? On whom was the duty of lighting incumbent?[2] on women as well as men? (Ib.) In one point of ritual there was a noticeable difference of theory: whereas the House of Hillel defined as the correct practice that which has subsequently prevailed, according to which the number of lights is increased each night, the House of Shammai held that the greatest illumination should take place

[1] Cp. T. B. Schab. 23a, p. כג at top ועוד מדקא מברכינן אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו להדליק נר של חנכה.

[2] א' ר' יהשוע ב' לוי נשים חייבות בנר שאף היו באותו הנס.

on the first night, and the number of lights should be decreased by one on each consecutive night. (*Shab.* 21b.)

The sumptuous meals, the fair boughs and palms, the lights, may together suggest an analogy with European Christmas rites, the ultimate connexion of which with solstitial festivals is commonly allowed. In particular the custom of lighting an *increasing* number of lights as the days of the festival increase might well be one of those symbolic or sympathetic rites which mark or, in the original intention, perhaps, assist the recovery of the Sun's light when the days have been contracted to their shortest and have begun or promise to lengthen, a fit rite for the 'dies natalis Solis invicti'.

I say this combination of rites *might* be derived from a solstitial festival. But the question is: Are they? And in considering this it is certainly important to note how closely they are paralleled, not to say repeated, at other Jewish festivals. The Ḥanukkah fare may have been the most sumptuous of the year, yet 'good cheer' was characteristic of all the great annual festivals: we would recall that, in Deuteronomy, 'to eat before Yahweh' is virtually a synonym for 'to observe one of the great annual festivals'. The bearing of fair boughs is more conspicuous in the history and modern observance of the Feast of Booths in October than it is of Ḥanukkah in December. It is true that the words of Lev. $23^{40}$, 'Ye shall take you on the first day (of the Feast of Booths) the fruit of goodly trees, fronds of palm trees and boughs of thick trees and willows of the brook', may have originally referred to the boughs used in the construction of the festal booths: so it is understood in Neh. $8^{15}$; but at least as early as the Book of Jubilees they were understood to refer to greenery carried in the hands. Jubilees carries back the Feast of Booths to the age of Abraham, and of Abraham's observation of it says ($16^{31}$) that he 'took branches of palms and the fruit of goodly trees, and every day going round the altar with the branches seven times a day he prayed and gave thanks to God.' Again Josephus says, 'we keep the festival . . . carrying in our hands branches of myrtle and willow, and a branch of the palm tree, and also a citron'; and the Mishnah tractate *Sukkah*, c. 3, contains elaborate regulations concerning the *lulab*, as this arrangement of greenery carried in the hands was termed, and in

particular cites Rabbi Yohanan b. Zakkai[1] (*c.* A.D. 70) for his decision after the fall of the Temple that henceforward the *lulab* should be everywhere carried on every day of the festival, whereas formerly this regulation applied only to Jerusalem, those who were outside Jerusalem carrying the *lulab* only on the first day.

Again the kindling of lights was not peculiar to Ḥanukkah. For example, of the Feast of Booths we read in the Mishnah: 'At the end of the first day of the Feast (of Booths) a descent was made into the court of the women and great preparations were made there. There were golden lamp stands with four golden saucers apiece at the top of their stems, and four youths of priestly lineage with pitchers of oil containing 120 logs in their hands, which they were pouring into the saucers. Out of the rags of the breeches of the priests were wicks made: these were lighted and there was not a house in Jerusalem which was not illuminated by the light in the Temple-Courts (בית השואבה) (Sukkah $5^{2}$). And there is an interesting passage in Josephus that refers to lighted lamps as characteristic of Jewish festivals generally: this occurs in the *Cont. Ap.* ii. 9. Apion says Josephus quotes a fable that 'while the Jews were once at war with the Idumaeans there came a man out of one of the cities of the Idumaeans, that are called Dorians, who then had worshipped Apollo. This man, whose name is said to have been Zabidus, came to the Jews, and promised that he would deliver Apollo the god of Dora into their hands, and that he would come to our Temple, if they would all depart thence. The whole multitude of the Jews believed this: Zabidus made him a certain wooden instrument, and put it round about him and set three rows of lamps thereon, and walked after such a manner that he appeared to those who stood a great way off him to be a kind of star walking upon the earth; so that the Jews were terribly frightened at so surprising an appearance, and stood very quiet at a distance: and Zabidus, while they remained very quiet, went into the holy house, and carried off that golden head of an ass (for so politely does he write), and then went his way back to Dora in great haste. Very well then we also might say that on that ass, to wit himself, Apion puts a load, and indeed a heavy load of fooleries and lies.' Then after criticizing the geographical follies of the fable, Josephus

[1 Suk. $3^{12}$.]

continues, 'Were our fathers so easily persuaded that Apollo had come to them, and did they think that in company with the stars they saw him walking on the earth? At that rate forsooth never a lamp had they seen who yet celebrated such and so great lamp-festivals' (*οἱ τὰς τοιαύτας καὶ τηλικαύτας λυχνοκαΐας ἐπιτελοῦντες*). Finally the custom of kindling lights in the home for the Sabbath, in connexion with which the Jewish tradition provides a blessing similar to that pronounced over the Ḥanukkah lights, is at least more ancient than the Mishnah which alludes to the custom: carelessness in regard to the kindling of the Sabbath light is one of the three sins that cause Jewish women to die at childbirth (*Shab.* $2^6$, cp. $2^7$). Much then is common to Ḥanukkah and other festivals, especially that of the Feast of Booths, and cannot therefore point to a connexion with the winter solstice *in particular*.

The one striking peculiarity of the Ḥanukkah ritual consists not in the illuminations themselves but in the custom of increasing the number of lights with the progress of the feast; and that peculiarity might no doubt be explained by the idea lying behind solstitial observances; but unfortunately with regard to this particular practice there was a difference of tradition and theory: the house of Shammai, which sometimes represents the older practice, held that the largest number of lights should be lighted on the first night of the festival and that the number should be *reduced* by one on each successive night of the feast. Such a practice would, presumably, be of ill omen, betokening or promoting a further decrease in the light and extent of the dying sun; it is therefore unlikely as a solstitial rite.[1]

As against the significance of the later similarity of the observance of the Ḥanukkah and the Feast of Booths the possibility must be allowed of an increasing assimilation and an original greater diversity: to such increasing similarity it is possible that the present and Talmudic ritual of the *lulab* at the Feast of Booths is due. Yet a considerable initial resemblance between the two festivals must be admitted to account for the description of Ḥanukkah in 2 Macc. as 'the Feast of Tabernacles in the month Chisleu'.

[1] Candles at Christmas (Frazer, *Balder*, i. 255–60): but Yule log more common—yet this for illumination: ib.

In view of all the facts it is difficult to regard the solstitial origin of Ḥanukkah as established, and least of all is the mere name φῶτα a sufficient proof as Ewald held (*History E. T.* V. 312 n. 2). But if we could so regard it the question would arise: ought we to infer, then, that the Jews from a remote period of their settlement in Canaan had observed a great festival at the winter solstice; or was the solstitial festival that was transformed into an historical commemoration of the Dedication of the New Altar in 165 itself a relatively late introduction into the Jewish festal cycle?[1] Was it, for example, one of the results of the contact with Greek customs and ideas? Such a suggestion would certainly labour under difficulties, yet it is doubtful whether it is easier to believe that the observance of a great mid-winter festival was a part of ancient Hebrew life: if it was, why did it fail to secure a place along with the great spring and autumn festivals in the calendar of the Law? Why, unlike these other feasts, was it not marked by increase in the offerings of burnt-offerings? Why has it failed to leave any trace in the Samaritan liturgy or the Samaritan practice? Though perhaps, indeed, we could give this last question a rather different form and ask: why, if the Jews Hellenized in accepting a mid-winter festival, did the Samaritans fail to do so?

A New Year's festival is the normal mark of solar revolution, though the Mohammedans[2] have found it possible to mark the beginning of each recurring twelfth month in their purely lunar year which falls behind the sun by eleven days every year, and by rather more than a month every three years. Still we may safely look upon the Hebrew New Year's festival as marking approximately a solar revolution. This will complete the festivals certainly or possibly affected by astronomical considerations. But before proceeding to some further discussion of this festival it will be convenient to summarize the results of our examination of the astronomical influence in the Jewish festal cycle and its relation to the influence of agriculture and history.

The celebration of the days of new moon can have had nothing

[1] 'Wahrscheinlich . . . aus einem heidnischem Fest herübergenommen', Dalman in *PRE* $7^{15}$.

[2] Cp. Frazer, *Balder the Beautiful*, i. 216 ff. Fires kindled by some African Mohammedans both at the summer solstice and on the moveable New Year's Day, 13th of Muharram.

to do with either history or agriculture. They are, therefore, partly astronomical in origin, and probably rest ultimately on some lunar religion, though even in our earliest Hebrew sources the celebration of these days appears to have been wholly subordinated to the worship of Yahweh.[1] The two great festal weeks in spring and autumn begin, according to the calendars of Lev. and Num., on days of full moon: and in particular on the days of full moon immediately after the equinoxes. If lunar religion gave rise to the observance of new moons, we might look to the same source for the ultimate explanation of the full-moon festivals; and possibly we should do so; but we have to observe that in the earliest codes (Ex. 23 and 34) these festivals, which later were certainly fixed for days of full moon, are either not fixed, or are not fixed by reference to the moon or to a particular day of a lunar month: the Feast of Unleavened Bread is fixed (though this probably is an added clause) for the month Abib, though not for any particular day in it; the Feast of Ingathering is fixed at the year's outgoing or circuit. Like the third pilgrimage-feast, these feasts are either by name or clause fixed in connexion with agricultural operations; the Feast of Unleavened Bread for the month of Abib, i. e. of young ears (of barley); the Feast of Harvest (Ex. $23^{16}$) or Weeks (Ex. $34^{22}$) for the firstfruits of wheat harvest or (in Dt.[2]) for seven weeks after the sickle is put to the standing corn (barley): and finally the Feast of Ingathering for the time when the last products of the agricultural year have been gathered in. The predominance of interest in agriculture over the moon in a calendar, both in the laws and in the general thought of the people out of which the names of the feasts sprang, is obvious; but may it be that even in early Israel the spring and autumn festivals were actually celebrated at full moon? If they were this would at once account for the festivals being fixed for the fifteenth days of the months in the later calendar, and for the intermediate feast of harvest which in Deuteronomy is fixed at seven weeks from a necessarily agricultural operation, being even in the fixed calendar left undefined by day and month. There was no more impossibility in earlier than in later times in making the *religious observance* of certain stages in the agricultural year fall on the full moon;

[1] Cp., later, Jubilees $12^{16ff.}$ [2] Dt. $16^{9ff.}$]

and though the literary form of 1 Ki. $12^{32f.}$ is certainly not early, we may perhaps, from the statement there that Jeroboam fixed the Feast (of Ingathering) for the fifteenth day of the eighth month, infer that both in Israel and Judah this feast even in early times was observed from the full moon, but in Israel one month later than in Judah. That harvest fell *exactly* one month later in Israel than in Judah is unlikely.

Solar influence combined with lunar influence to keep the two great agricultural festivals of the year to the time of the spring and autumn equinoxes; it *may* also, though this is doubtful, have originated a winter solstitial festival which only survived transformed into an historical commemoration in the Roll of Fasting. In that same late Jewish calendar we find possible traces of one or two further lunar festivals.

Before passing from the parts played in the festal calendar by astronomical and agricultural considerations, it may be well to recall how naturally these may originally have been associated: agricultural operations are, as a matter of fact, timed by celestial phenomena. Two or three illustrations taken from Sir J. J. Frazer's *Pleiades in Primitive Calendars*[1] may serve: The natives of the Torres Straits islands observe the appearance of the Pleiades on the horizon at sunset, and when they see it they say that the new year's time has come. . . . In some districts of northern Celebes the rice-fields are similarly prepared for cultivation when the Pleiades are seen at a certain height above the horizon. As to the Dyaks of Sarawak we read that 'the Pleiades themselves tell them when to farm: and according to their position in the heavens, morning and evening, do they cut down the forest, burn, plant, or reap. The Malays are bound to follow their example, or their lunar year would soon render their farming operations unprofitable.'

In a broad survey of Hebrew festivals the most striking and, from the point of view of Hebrew religion, the most interesting feature of their history is the increasing and at last the dominating historical character of them. Earlier festivals of purely agricultural or of agricultural and astronomical origin become associated with historical events; and new festivals commemorating other historical events are introduced. As early as the

[1] Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, i. 313f.

Yahwist, say the ninth century B. C., the Feast of Unleavened Bread was associated with the Exodus from Egypt, and was a commemoration of it; according to Lev. $23^{40-43}$ the Feast of Booths commemorates the fact that Yahweh caused the Israelites to dwell in booths when he brought them out of the land of Egypt. The third agricultural festival, the Feast of Harvest, receives no historical motive in the Old Testament, but it was later regarded as a memorial of the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai, which was traditionally assigned to the sixth or seventh of Sivan (Abrahams, *PB* cxcii). The observance of the first of the seventh month, or Tishri, is required in the Old Testament calendar, but here again the historical motive is supplied later; it is, naturally enough, the anniversary of Creation;[1] it is also the anniversary of the binding of Isaac to the altar (Abrahams, Authorised Daily Prayer Book, cxcix, T. B. Rosh Hashshanah 10 b). In Philo it commemorates the giving of the Law (De Septen. 22 (Mangey ii. 295)). In the Book of Jubilees (first century B. C.) we find fresh historical motives for the ancient festivals; and the great majority of the thirty-five semi-festivals mentioned in the Roll of Fasting arose in the first instance and continued to commemorate historical events falling for the most part between the rise of the Maccabees and the Destruction of the Temple. This increasing dominance of the historical motive in Jewish festivals is but one manifestation of an outstanding element in the Jewish conception of God: God is pre-eminently a God of Providence manifesting Himself in and guiding the history of nations.

Closely connected in the calendar with the Day of Atonement, of which I shall treat in the next lecture, is New Year's Day, and with some discussion of this I close the present lecture.

Like other peoples, the Jews have in the course of their history varied the season and month in which their year began; and partly in consequence of this there came to be at the same time different years beginning at different dates: according to

[1] But in view of the alternative New Year in 1 Nisan it is not surprising that another opinion was that the world was created on that day: so R. Joshua, *Summarius*, iii. 312 a, and Philo (on the 5th festival, De Septen. 19 (Mangey, ii. 293)); ct. Jubilees $17^{15}$, $18^{19}$, which places the birth of Isaac in the first month, inferentially on the fifteenth day, i. e. at Unleavened Bread.

the custom codified in the Mishnah, 'There are four beginnings (ראשי) of the year: on the first of Nisan is the beginning of the year for kings and festivals, on the first of Elul is the beginning of the year for the tithing of the cattle, though R. Shim'on asserted that this fell on the first of Tishri: on the first of Tishri is the beginning of the year for purposes of chronology, for reckoning years of release and years of Jubilee, and also for plants and herbs: on the first of Shebat is the beginning of the year for fires according to the House of Shammai, whereas the House of Hillel assigns it to the fifteenth of the same month.'[1]

Two of these New Years we find, one exactly, one approximately, in the O.T. In the festal calendar of Lev. 23 (Num. 28f.), the first month of the year is the month in which Passover occurs, i.e. the spring month Nisan: and in Ex. $12^{1f.}$ (P) it is categorically stated, in a manner which has rightly been understood to indicate a novelty, a change from existing custom, that 'this month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you'. Presumably, the *first* of the month was the first day of the year, or as we should say New Year's Day; but the Hebrew term *rosh hashshanah*, the equivalent of our New Year's Day, is not applied to it, for the very good reason, however, that that term if it occurred at all in the O.T. did not refer even in the one passage where it is supposed to occur to a particular *day*.

Of the beginning of the year in autumn, though neither day nor month is mentioned, we have clear evidence in the early law of the festivals: the Feast of Ingathering (אסף) was to be held בצאת השנה, when the year goes forth. This clause is commonly understood to mean when the year ends, on the last days of the year. When one year ends, another begins; beginning and ending alike fall after the ingathering in autumn. But it is really more probable that 'When the year goes forth' means 'When the year *begins*'; the sun goes forth from his chambers when he *begins* to shine (Ps. $19^{6}$) and goes home at the end of the day (מבוא); man *goes forth* to begin his daily work (Ps. $104^{23}$): the stars come or go (יצא) forth when they begin to shine (Is. $40^{26}$). And similarly in Assyrian the same verb יצא is used of the beginning of the

[1] *Rosh Hash-shanah*, i. 1; cp. for the two commencements in Nisan and Tishri, Jos. *Ant.* i. $3^{3}$.

year: iš-tu ûmi ša šattu uṣ-ṣi [adi ûm] u-ṣu-ra-ti='from the day when the year set forth to the day of the end' Del. (cited from Creation Tablets) *Creation*, v. 5: so *ṣit šamši* is the rising of the sun: *ṣit arḫi* the *beginning* of the month.[1] The interpretation was suggested by Riedel fifteen years ago, and receives confirmation from the since discovered Gezer Calendar. In this, the month of ingathering is not the last but first of the series. The difference of interpretation does not greatly affect the time of the beginning of the year, but it does affect the character of the Festival of Ingathering. It must no longer be regarded as a festival of the old year: it is a festival of the New Year; the first or one of the first duties of the Israelite in the New Year was to rejoice festally before Yahweh, and so praise and thank him for his goodness in bringing to fruition the agricultural labours of the year that was past. Whether the festival fell on precisely the first seven days of the New Year we cannot say: if the inference is legitimate that it fell of old, as it fell later, on the full moon, it seems a fortnight after the year had ended, unless we could believe that the year began not with the new but with the full moon.

We may next pass to Ezekiel: in the Hebrew text of 40[1] is the sole occurrence in the O.T. of the phrase (ראש השנה)=Assyr. *rêš šatti*; but (1) the LXX reads ἔν τῷ πρώτῳ μηνί=בראשון,[2] *in the first month*: and, since the Hebrew fails to give the number of the month, though this is regularly done in other dates in Ezekiel, e. g. in the first month in $29^{17}$, $30^{20}$, so the seventh in $45^{20}$ (LXX, where Eerdmans and Bertholet both adopt LXX), LXX is probably to be preferred to MT: (2) if N.T. rather than LXX preserves the original text, ראש השנה is used not as in later Hebrew of New Year's *Day*, but of a period of about ten days long: 'at the beginning of the year on the tenth of the month'; the alternative inference, viz. that the tenth of the month was in Ezekiel's time New Year's Day, is very improbable and involves him at the same time in the curious tautology 'on New Year's Day, on the tenth of the month' and the negligent omission of the month intended: (3) if the view last mentioned were right, we should be in doubt whether Ezekiel's New Year's Day was in

[1] But this reading is not generally accepted, modern editors reading *uṣ-ṣi*[*ra*] for *uṣ-ṣi*[*a-diûm*] 'after he had defined (?) the days of the year by signs'.]
[2] Toy.

Nisan (spring) or Tishri (autumn). In any case it is unwise to base far-reaching conclusions, as Eerdmans and Benzinger (*New Year* in *E.Bi.*), and in a less degree e. g. Bertholet, do, on the at least uncertain text of MT.

For the rest Ezekiel is of interest from the fact that he makes the new moons of both the first and (following LXX against MT in $45^{20}$) the seventh months, i. e. Nisan and Tishri, days of expiation of the Temple by means of the blood of an expiatory bullock. A fortnight after each of these days of expiation follow the two great ancient seven-day festivals, termed by Ezekiel the Passover and the Feast. The maintenance of the balance of the year, the recognition of the alternative Babylonian beginning of the year in the spring as well as of the old Hebrew New Year in the autumn, the emphasizing of the need for expiation are among the motives that may have affected Ezekiel; but precisely how much is new and how much is old is not immediately to be determined.

The remaining references in the O.T. to a festival of the New Year as falling on what was later known as New Year's Day (ראש השנה) occur in the festal calendars of Lev. 23 and Num. 28 —both in P or $P^s$. Though according to P Nisan was to be the beginning of months, the first of that month was in no way distinguished from that of any other new moon; on the other hand, the first of the *seventh* month is a special festival; later, e. g. the first and last days of the autumn feast, it is a day of abstention from servile work, though not from all work, as the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement: in respect of the special sacrifices for the day this day of the seventh new moon of the year differs from special sacrifices for other new moons, much as the special Sabbath offering differs from the daily offering; on the Sabbath exactly twice as many victims were offered as on a week-day, viz. four lambs as against two; the special offering for the seventh new moon consisted of twice as many lambs, rams, and goats as were offered especially on other new moons, and of three bullocks as against two. So far, then, the seventh new-moon festival might be, from the standpoint of P, less a New Year's festival than a Sabbath festival among the new moons, as is the Sabbath festival among the days of the week, the seventh year among years, and the year of Jubilee (after $7 \times 7$) among

Sabbatical years. A further mark of the day was the blowing of trumpets (Lev. $23^{24}$ (זכרון תרועה) cp. ? Ps. $81^{4}$ [E.V.$^{3}$]), which gave a name to the day (יום תרועה, Num. $29^{1}$), though *a* blowing of trumpets (חצצרת) took place on all new moons (Num. $10^{10}$) and festivals (מועדיכם ib.).

For the *ideas* associated with the autumnal New Year we find clear evidence only at a later date. And firstly, briefly but very frequently in the Mishnah: 'At four seasons the world is judged (מדין): at Passover in respect of the (harvest) produce (תבואה): at Pentecost in respect of the fruit of trees: on New Year's Day all who come into the world (i.e. all men) pass before him as sheep, so it is said "he that fashioneth the hearts of all, that considereth all their works" (Ps. $33^{15}$): and at the Feast of Tabernacles the world is judged in respect of water'.[1] On New Year's Day, then, by A. D. 200 at latest it was believed that God inquired into and judged the hearts and works of men.

What is meant by this judgement of all living on New Year's Day is developed in the Gemara[2]: 'R. Johanan said, Three books are opened on New Year's Day, one for the entirely wicked, one for the entirely righteous, and one for the intermediate. The entirely righteous are inscribed and straightway sealed for life; the entirely wicked are inscribed and straightway sealed for death; the intermediate are suspended and stand over from New Year's Day to the Day of Atonement: if they then are pure they are inscribed for life, and if not pure they are inscribed for death.'

There is reason to believe that the Gemara is not here as often spinning explanations of an expression in the Mishnah out of a fertile imagination, but is explaining that expression by ideas which actually lay behind the Mishnah phrase and were traditional with the Gemarists; in any case the essential and striking idea here, that of the determination of destiny at the New Year, is old enough—in Babylon. In Nisan, the first of the Babylonian months, 'the king of the gods, Marduk, and the sons of heaven and earth (assembled) in . . . the House of the New Year's festival', or, as it is elsewhere called, the chamber of destiny, and there decreed the destinies for the New Year.[3]

[1 Shab. 2.]

[2] Surenhusius, *Versio Latina atque Notae ad Mischnam*, ii. 313 b.

[3] *KAT*$^{3}$ 514, n. 6, 515.

The judgement of all living on New Year's Day referred to in the Mishnah is an old idea: but how ancient as an element in Jewish thought? That is not easy to answer except by the rough and ready but easily erroneous Pan-Babylonian method that all that was thought in Babylon was also thought *at the same time* in Judea. But we probably find a trace of this thought that the first of the seventh month was a day of destiny, though in a somewhat different form, as early as Jubilees. Abraham, we read, 'sat up throughout the night of the new moon of the seventh month to observe the stars from the evening to the morning in order to see what would be the character of the year with regard to the rains'. But as he sat it was revealed to him that stars and sun and moon did not determine the rains: but God in whose hands they were.

But can we trace the Jewish idea of New Year's Day as a day of destiny earlier? Eerdmans has argued that we can, and that the idea was current in ancient Israel. His argument is interesting, possibly because it lacks nothing in temerity. He starts with the later custom of horn-blowing on New Year's Day. Horn or trumpet-blowing, as we have seen, was not confined to New Year's Day; but since this day was called the day of blowing (of horns) we may assume that there was something peculiar in the horn-blowing of that day, just as the name of Lights attached to the Feast of Dedication suggested some peculiarity in the light ritual of that day. Eerdmans proceeds: (*Alttest. Stud.* Lev. iv. 79) In *Rosh hashshanah* 3$^{7f.}$ it is laid down that this day every one must *hear* the blast of the horn. It was blown not only in the synagogues but also in the streets. This general ritual of noise recalls the custom prevalent elsewhere of blowing trumpets, ringing bells, or making other noises on New Year's Day. Why were these noises made? Certainly to drive away all the maleficent spirits who were about on this day in unusual numbers. We have no direct evidence that the ancient Hebrews held this belief: it is a hypothesis only, and it will be observed that Eerdmans's hypotheses are increasing and he has need of others before he reaches his goal. If the trumpet-blowing proves that hordes of spirits were abroad in the earth who had to be frightened, he must ask why they were particularly numerous on New Year's Day. The modern Mandaeans know,

and so the ancient Hebrews *may* have known the reason: it was because the good spirits were on this day away in heaven and unable to keep a check on the bad ones. And the reason why the good spirits were all in heaven was that they were participating in fixing the destinies for the coming year.

There is nothing impossible, nothing perhaps very improbable, in the assumption that the ancient Hebrews believed that on the first day of the year evil spirits were abroad, and that they blew trumpets to alarm them, and that the framers of the Law incorporated this ancient custom with some modification in the priestly law-book. But if we turn away from hypothesis and come back to facts, we may say this: in ancient Israel, at the beginning of the year, though whether actually from the first day of it we cannot certainly say, people kept the seven-day festival of Ingathering. Later, whether it was the case earlier or not, they still kept the Feast of Ingathering beginning on the fifteenth day of the New Year, having previously observed with ceremonies the first day of the month, which later still was certainly called New Year's Day. Between New Year's Day and the beginning of the ancient seven-day New Year Festival fell, certainly in later times, the Day of Atonement. And the relation between New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement is, perhaps, as close in thought and purpose as it is in time.

# XX

## THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

'THE tenth day of the seventh month, Tishri (the Day of Atonement) is the most important of all the holy days.' Such is the statement of a writer so representative of modern Judaism as Friedländer.[1] Nor does he express a merely modern estimate: for the past 1700 years at least the Day of Atonement has been *Yoma Rabba*, the great day, or *Yoma*, *the* day of the Jewish year.[2] In the interest of Christian theologians and students among the holy days of Judaism the Day of Atonement shares with the Passover first place. Yet in the earlier history of the Hebrew religion we find no trace of the day, and, unless appearances deceive us, it is a holy day that gained its place in the sacred calendar relatively late, and, as many have concluded, after the Babylonian exile and not before the fifth century B.C. If the conclusion be correct, a study of this day becomes obviously of the utmost importance in estimating the trend of the Jewish religion.

In the festal calendar of Lev. 23 the peculiar *character* of the day is suggested, without being emphasized; but in the companion section of Num. 28, 29, the quantity of sacrifices specified for this day do not suggest that the day was, sacrificially, of supreme importance. The prescribed sacrifices are, apart from the sin-offering of atonement—the amount of which is not specified in the calendar, but which we otherwise know not to have been great—the same as the sacrifices required on the first and second days of the seventh month; they are slightly less than on the several days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Feast of Booths.

The 'Great Day' of the Jewish year is not then the day on

[1] *Jewish Religion*, p. 495.

[2] Cf. Philo, cited by Orelli in *PRE* 580, 42 ff.

which the largest *number* of sacrifices was required; nor is it, as its alternative title the Day of Atonement or Expiation might suggest, the day on which the more directly expiatory sacrifices, viz. the sin-offerings, outnumbered other types of sacrifice. Combining with the quantities defined in Num. 28 f. the quantities of the special sin-offerings given in Lev. 16 and in part covered by the phrase 'the sin-offering of Atonement' in Num. 29, we find that the burnt-offerings of the day consisted of seven yearling sheep, three rams, and two bullocks, the sin-offerings of one bullock and three goats. The peculiarity of the day lies rather in certain details of the expiatory ritual, in the range of applicability of this ritual, and above all in the fact that the entire day, from evening to evening, had to be spent fasting. It is this last feature in the observance of the day that marks off the tenth day of the seventh month from all other days, whether in the festival calendar of the Pentateuch or the later Megillath Ta'anith; all other days in these calendars were days of joy on which it was forbidden to fast; on this day fasting was obligatory, to break one's fast on it was mortal sin: 'for every person on that day who doth not mortify himself (i.e. fast) shall be cut off from his father's kin' (Lev. $23^{29}$). The tenth day of the seventh month was accordingly known not only as the Day or the Great Day of the Jewish calendar, but also as the Fast (ἡ νηστεία, Acts $27^{9}$, Philo, *De Septen.* 26 (Mangey, ii. 278); ἡ νηστείας ἑορτή, Philo, *De Septen.* 23 (Mangey, ii. 296)) or the Great Fast (צום רבא *PRE*, p. 577.[1]

Fasts not prescribed in the Law, like many of the feasts, were commemorations of historical events: of these the most stringent, that which fell on the ninth of Ab, commemorated the destruction of the Temple, which according to tradition occurred on this day alike in 586 B.C. and A.D. 70. It is noticeable that the Day of Atonement strongly maintained its institutional character and never took on any well-defined memorial character. This is the more remarkable if 'the day of the Fast', on which Jerusalem was captured by Pompey in 63 and again by Herod's soldiers in 37 B.C., was the Day of Atonement (see Schürer, loc. cit.). The Book of Jubilees, indeed, provides a mournful occasion for the origin of the feast: 'The sons of Jacob slaughtered a kid, and

[1] Cp. Schürer, *E.T.* I. i. 322, n. 2, 398.

dipped the coat of Joseph in the blood and sent it to Jacob on the tenth of the seventh month. And he mourned all that night, for they had brought it to him in the evening . . . and all the members of his house were grieving and mourning with him all that day. . . . For this reason it is ordained for the children of Israel that they should afflict themselves (i.e. fast) on the tenth of the seventh month and . . . that they should make atonement for themselves thereon with a young goat on the tenth of the seventh month, once a year, for their sins: for they had grieved the affection of their father regarding Joseph his son. And this day has been ordained that they should grieve thereon for their sins, and for all their transgressions and for all their errors, so that they might cleanse themselves on that day once a year.' But we may remark (1) that this theory of a commemorative element in the observance of the Day of Atonement appears to be merely an extreme illustration of the inveterate habit of the author of Jubilees to invent historical circumstances to explain Jewish holy days; (2) his theory appears to have had little, if any, influence; (3) even in Jubilees the institutional character of the Day somewhat obviously eclipses its historical character: the observance is not mainly to commemorate Jacob's sorrows, but in order that the children of Israel may once a year cleanse themselves from their sins.

With regard to this chief day of the Jewish sacred year I propose to consider first and briefly its history; secondly the separate rites and their antiquity; and thirdly the ideas reflected or promoted by the observance of the day and their place in Jewish religion.

According to the theory of the Pentateuch the Day of Atonement and its ritual is of Mosaic origin. The occasion of the law was the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu for having presented strange fire before Yahweh—Lev. $10^{1\text{-}7}$, $16^{1}$. As we have already seen, the author of Jubilees assigned an earlier and different origin to the Day. But it is, of course, the theory of the Pentateuch that prevailed till the age of the critical examination of the Pentateuch. So soon and so far as the theory that the Priestly Code is of post-exilic origin was accepted, the theory of the Pentateuch itself that the Day of Atonement was an institution of Mosaic antiquity became untenable: for outside the

Priestly Code the Day of Atonement is never mentioned in the Pentateuch, nor, indeed, in the rest of the Old Testament. Literary criticism did not indeed itself disprove the antiquity of the institution, for an institution may be older, even centuries older, than the date of the first records of it in literature, for the simple reason that literature of a kind likely to mention it may not have existed for centuries after the institution had come into existence; but literary criticism raises the problem: was the Day of Atonement an institution of great antiquity, and is it merely by accident that it is never mentioned in pre-exilic literature? Or was it of late origin and, therefore, of necessity unmentioned in the earlier literature? Mere lack of mention is inconclusive in such cases: it is, for instance, of not the slightest significance that whereas the Day of Atonement *is* mentioned in the festal calendars of Lev. 23, Num. 28 and 29, it is not mentioned in the law of the pilgrimage-festivals in the early law-books; for the Day of Atonement is an 'appointed season' and therefore appropriately finds its place in the calendar; it is not a חג and therefore could have had no place in the law of the pilgrimage-festivals. If it was a prominent institution in early Israel it might perhaps be expected to be regulated by law elsewhere in the early law-books, though it would be unwise to press even this point very far. The strength of the positive argument against an ancient observance of the tenth day of the seventh month as a Day of Atonement, and also against the existence of any completely similar institution on some other day of the year, rests on two passages which, so far from merely omitting to mention it, appear to exclude it. The first of these is Ez. $45^{18ff.}$; Ezekiel here provides for *two* annual 'unsinnings' (חטא v. 18) or expiations for (כפר v. 20) the sanctuary (המקדש v. 18) or the Temple (הבית); the one of these falls on the first day of the first month, the other on the first day of the seventh month; expiation is made by means of the blood of a *bullock*, which is applied to (נתן על) the doorposts of the Temple, to the four corners of the ledge of the altar, and to the posts of the gate of the inner court. The bullock is thus the stated offering for these annual days of Atonement. In the following verses we have the stated offerings for the great yearly festivals and for sabbaths and new moons. But the tenth day of the seventh month is not mentioned among the

days on which special sacrificial offerings are required, nor as a matter of fact is it mentioned at all. The omission of the day from what is obviously a complete survey of occasions of special public sacrifices such as mark the Day of Atonement in Lev. 16 can only be explained on one of two grounds: either the observance of the Day of Atonement on the tenth of the seventh month was unknown to Ezekiel, or, knowing it, he deliberately substituted for it two annual observances neither of which was to fall on the—by the hypothesis—more ancient Day of Atonement. For such an omission by Ezekiel no ground can be assigned. But, moreover, the object of the expiatory ceremony is in Ezekiel limited to the *Temple*; in Lev. 16 the objects of the expiatory ceremony are both the Temple and also the entire people of Israel. Once again it seems to be difficult to account for Ezekiel so modifying an old observance of a Day of Atonement as to exclude the people from the virtue of both the Days of Atonement he substitutes for it.

But Ezekiel does not stand alone in showing no knowledge of a Day of Atonement on the tenth of the seventh month. As has often been pointed out: on the first and second days of the seventh month (in 444 B.C.) the great public assembly and the reading of the Law by Ezra took place, from the fifteenth to the twenty-second of the same month was devoted according to law, as the same narrative points out, to the observance of Feasts of Booths; and on the twenty-fourth of the same month a special day of public assembly, fasting and confession was observed; but nothing is said of any observance of the tenth of the month, or of this special observance on the twenty-fourth having for particular reasons taken its place.

The most recent attempt to maintain the pre-exilic existence of the Day of Atonement on the tenth of the first month has been made by Eerdmans (*Alttest. Stud.*, iv., *Leviticus* 73ff). As a matter of fact Eerdmans maintains also the pre-exilic date of P, which if admitted would carry with it the pre-exilic origin of the Day of Atonement. Into this wider literary discussion it is impossible to enter here. But Eerdmans also advances certain arguments in favour of the pre-exilic origin of Lev. 16 and in particular of the day therein described. He argues positively that the ritual of Lev. 16 must be pre-exilic because it prescribes rites which

could only be performed so long as the ark existed, and the ark ceased to exist before the exile. This is a particular application of the argument for the existence of the Tabernacle as described in P, and once again the wider question must be passed by here. But it is pertinent to observe (1) that, if the Tabernacle is rightly regarded as a projection into the past of the Temple, it is by no means inconsistent with the general method of P for him to take into account these ideal objects in framing his details of description, ritual, or procedure; (2) the comparison of the elaboration of ritual casuistry in the Mishnah furnishes an important parallel for the elaboration in description of a rite which it was no longer possible to perform; and (3) that it is possible the ritual treatment of the ark may have been derived from tradition of actual usage. On this subject I have more to say immediately.

But Eerdmans also endeavours to meet the damaging argument afforded by Ezekiel and Nehemiah against the pre-exilic origin of the Day of Atonement as described in Lev. 16. With regard to Ezekiel he endeavours to make two points: (1) that Ezekiel shows himself acquainted with a New Year's period of ten days, i.e. extending from the first to the tenth day of the seventh month. This rests on assuming that the Hebrew text is correct in Ez. 40[1] which reads 'in the beginning of the year, on the first day of the month' whereas LXX reads 'in the first month on the tenth day of the month'. Even if the Hebrew rather than the Greek text be accepted, though it may follow that at least as much as ten days went by the name of 'the beginning of the year', it by no means follows that the tenth day of the month had any special pre-eminence among these ten days, still less that in the time of Ezekiel it was a Day of Atonement. On the other hand it remains true that Ezekiel made no provision for special sacrifices on this day such as are prescribed in Lev. 23. Eerdmans's second point is that it is improbable that *the* Day of Atonement did not exist in Ezekiel's time, because he attempted to duplicate the consecration of the sanctuary. But the fact that Ezekiel provides for *two* annual expiations of the Temple, but no annual expiation of the people, is really a strong argument against the priority of P: if Ezekiel's *days* of Atonement were, as a superficial reading of Eerdmans might suggest, an exact duplication of P's Day of Atonement, this point by itself might favour the

secondary nature of Ezekiel's law; as a matter of fact Ezekiel's two days of Atonement have a less extensive aim and effect than P's one day of Atonement.

With regard to Nehemiah 9, all that Eerdmans can find to say is that the narrative does not suggest that the *Busstag*—penitential day—the day of fasting and confession which was held on the twenty-fourth of the seventh month—was anything new and unusual. By this he does not and cannot mean that it had been hitherto customary to observe such a day on the twenty-fourth of the seventh month: and that fasting and confession were nothing new and unusual is true, but irrelevant to the question at issue, which is whether a day combining the rites of Lev. 16 and 23 had previously been observed in particular on the tenth of the seventh month.

Here, as often, it is of the first importance to distinguish between the antiquity of the component elements in a particular ritual or observance and the antiquity of the ritual or institution in which they coalesce. The union may have other results than those of the more ancient elements acting separately; the Day of Atonement may first have begun to exercise its peculiar influence in Jewish religion long after the various rites which entered into its observance had one and all of them separately at once reflected and influenced the life of the Jewish people.

Our knowledge of the ritual of the Day of Atonement rests principally on Num. 29 which records the quantities required of special sacrifices on the day, Lev. 16, and the Mishnah tract *Yoma*. Lev. 16 contains the ritual of the day as observed from towards the close of the fifth century B.C. at least and onwards: *Yoma* the ritual as observed in the last years of the Jewish Temple. In dealing with *Yoma* it is necessary, as always with the Mishnah, to allow for what we may term theoretical ritual, ritual that had never been observed in practice, nor had been received by the Rabbis of Mishnah as tradition of practice, but had been invented by them dialectically or casuistically. E.g. in *Yoma* 1[1] the designation of a spare priest to take the place of the high priest if he became ritually unclean may well rest on tradition; R. Jehuda's statement that they also appointed a woman to marry him the moment his wife should die is strongly casuistic exegesis. In *Yoma*, however, the really traditional seems greatly to exceed

what is possibly dialectical or casuistic. The record of the early ritual in Lev. 16 appears to be, from a literary point of view, composite. (Among the theories that have been held of the literary character of Lev. 16, that which has most prevailed perhaps is that which sees in the chapter a union of two laws, one regulating the conditions under which the high priest might enter the Holy of Holies, the other containing the ritual of the Day of Atonement.) Whatever its origin, Lev. 23 as a whole had for long governed practice on the Day of Atonement: *Yoma* assumes it and is mainly an account of the minuter details of practice stated more generally in Leviticus or in some cases of additional practices not suggested there, such, for example, as the minute regulations in *Yoma* for the conduct of the high priest on the seven days preceding, and especially on the day immediately preceding, the Day of Atonement. Some of this additional practice is antique in character, whether or not from the first associated with the Day of Atonement.

A rapid survey of the different rites of the day, with some reference to the antiquity of the individual rites, must suffice. The different elements in the observance of the day are as follows.

1. Abstention from work.
2. Fasting.
3. Special sacrifices for the day, where we have to distinguish:
   (*a*) The multiplication of the normal daily offering of burnt-offerings.
   (*b*) The directly expiatory sacrifices.
   (*c*) The prominence of the blood ritual.
4. Confession and the scape-goat (so in Lev. $16^{21}$: in *Yoma* two confessions also over Aaron's bullock and one over the scape-goat).

Abstention from business on certain days is a custom of great antiquity; such days with the Hebrews before the Exile were sabbaths and new moons (Am. $8^{5}$.) On the other hand, the extent of activity affected was apparently very much less in earlier than in later times. Cessation from ordinary agricultural work actually facilitated other forms of activity on the sabbath; the farmer's servants and asses were released from work in the fields, but for that very reason were free, for example,

as we gather from the story of the Shunamite's wife in 2 Ki. 4, to give the farmer's wife a pleasant outing; but such a use of the sabbath in later times was forbidden by the very limited distance it was permissible to walk, not to speak of the work involved in harnessing the asses. Again, Jehoiada the priest and devotee of Yahweh planned the stratagem by which Athaliah was overthrown for a sabbath (2 Ki. 11)—a striking contrast to the Maccabean soldiers, who were at first restrained by the observance of the sabbath from even defending themselves against attack. The particular abstention prescribed in Lev. 23 for the Day of Atonement is abstention on the later scale; whereas on other sacred days the law requires abstention from servile work, which corresponds roughly to *sabbath*-abstention in pre-exilic times. On the Day of Atonement, as on the sabbaths, it requires abstention from *all* work (Lev. $23^{28.\ 30\,f.}$). Moreover, the Day is here said to be שבת שבתון. Whether or not an observance of the tenth day of the seventh month goes back to pre-exilic times, it is probable that this custom of observing on it the later sabbatical cessation from *all* work is not earlier than the Exile.

Fasting, like abstention from work on certain days, is without doubt an ancient custom,[1] and is not infrequently referred to in early Hebrew literature, most often in connexion with private circumstances, as when, e. g., David fasts with a view to inducing Yahweh to pity him and spare the life of his child; but public fasts in which the people as a whole participated were also observed in early times. On the other hand, these early public fasts seem to have been observed as occasion arose, and not annually; the joyous days of Unleavened Bread, of Harvest, and of Thanksgiving recurred at the same season every year; but our existing early literature contains no allusion to a Day of Fasting which the Hebrews were required to observe every year, whatever the circumstances. Indeed the narrative of Jer. 36 seems to exclude such a day even as late as the end of the seventh century. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim (604 B. C.) Jeremiah commands Baruch to read his roll in the Temple on *a* fast day (יום צום); in the next year (603) in the ninth month, i.e. December,

[1] *E.Bi.* 1507.

the people proclaimed a fast and Baruch read the roll. Between Jeremiah's command and Baruch's execution of it the tenth day of the seventh month must have passed once if not twice. Why, if it was then an annual fast day, did Baruch wait at least two months, and perhaps fourteen months, before he read the roll?

With regard to the special sacrifices for the day it must suffice to recall here the conclusion reached in a previous lecture, that expiatory sacrifices, whether they were specifically termed *haṭṭâth* or not, were certainly offered before the Exile. The various types then, and, with the possible exception of the *haṭṭâth*, the various names for the several types of sacrifice offered on the day, were ancient. The question of a later element here turns on the precise regulation of quantity. If there was a public fast day before the Exile it was doubtless marked by some special sacrifices which need not have been essentially different from those presented in the law, though the precise definition of quantities is not likely to have been original. So again the blood ritual, which is so conspicuous in the observance of the day, must be in essence ancient enough, and in particular we may believe that the unsinning by this means of the Temple and altar, which forms the primary and sole-mentioned object of the day in Ezekiel and an important object in Lev. 23, was practised, and that, probably enough, periodically in the Temple at Jerusalem and at earlier sanctuaries too before the Exile.

Our judgement with regard to the scape-goat ritual must be similar. We must distinguish between the fundamental ritual element and the particular associations with which it appears. The one is certainly ancient enough, not to say primitive; the other of less certain age and probably enough late. The general principle of transferring sins physically to some animal or other medium, and, by then dismissing the medium, getting rid for good of the sins, is now recognized as a widespread practice associated with a stage of belief far nearer the primitive than the religion either of Ezra or of Moses. In various forms the principle has maintained itself with more or less characteristic modification in various historical primitive religions; and, alike in the guises which it has assumed in primitive religion and the religions of civilized people, it has been fully described by Sir J. E. Frazer in the *Golden Bough*, ii. 3, and *Golden Bough*, vi, 'The Scape-

goat'. The annual unloading of the sins of Israel on to the goat for Azazel is not the only trace of the custom in Jewish thought and practice. The meaning of the ritual with the two birds in the case of one recovered from leprosy [1] appears to be that the sin and disease of the convalescent was transmitted to the living bird, and so, as the bird flies away, dismissed from the man for good and all. And a similar type of thought appears to govern the form of Zechariah's vision of the wickedness of the whole land of Israel shut up in the form of a woman in a bushel and borne away by two other woman-forms to the land of Babylon.

Of the peculiarities of the Hebrew scape-goat ritual on the Day of Atonement it must suffice to refer briefly to two. Firstly, the goat which receives upon itself and carries away the sins of Israel is called the 'goat for Azazel', and to Azazel in the wilderness the goat is ultimately dismissed; but, secondly, in spite of the goat being thus regarded as sacred to, or made the property of, Azazel, it is brought intimately into relation with the worship of Yahweh, and its power to remove the sins of Israel is immediately associated with confession of sins *to Yahweh*. Of the second point first. It is unnecessary at this time of day to waste words proving that Azazel is as much a person as Yahweh—though exactly what kind of person is a much more open question. Yet Azazel in no sense in the law, still less in *Yoma*, stands on any equality with Yahweh, whatever may have possibly been the case in earlier popular religion. In the first place two male goats are selected by the priest of Yahweh as a means of expiation (Lev. $16^5$); then *both* goats are set *before Yahweh*; and only then, and still by the priest of Yahweh, lots are cast to decide to what use each goat is to be put (Lev. $16^{7,8}$): one goat is thus assigned to Yahweh, the other to Azazel (Lev. $16^{10}$). The goat retained for Yahweh is slain and then used for expiating the Temple; the goat for Azazel is once again set living *before Yahweh* (Lev. $16^{20}$): Aaron, i. e. the high priest, lays his hands on it and confesses over it all the iniquities of the Israelites and (so) transfers them to the goat, which is, now sin-laden, dismissed from the Temple of Yahweh into the wilderness, the home of Azazel: the sins, like the wickedness in Zechariah's vision which is dispatched to Babylon, are thus sent to an appropriate place or, this

[1] Lev. 14.

being peculiar to Leviticus, to an appropriate person, but in both cases the removal of sin is due to the power of Yahweh. Azazel receives the sins, but he is not active in ridding Israel of them; the goat bears the sins, but once again does not relieve Israel of sin; the goat can be loaded with Israel's sin and Azazel can or must receive them, *because Yahweh wills that* 'expiation shall be made for the Israelites from all their sins once a year' (v.[34]), and has willed that expiation shall be made by this procedure. Such is the theory of the framers of the law, though it may well be that the rite of the scape-goat here incorporated in the worship of Yahweh, for reasons we can only surmise, and at a time which we cannot closely define, was once observed with little or no recognition of Yahweh or of the truth that He only can remove sin. *Yoma* supplies what had at a later time become the fixed ritual of confession before the sins were considered to pass from Israel on to the goat; and this ritual of confession and response still further emphasizes the fact that Yahweh alone is the active principle in the expiation of sins: 'And thus the priest said, O Yahweh (הויה), thy people the house of Israel have committed iniquity, transgressed and sinned before thee: O Yahweh expiate now the iniquities, transgressions which thy people the house of Israel have committed, transgressed and sinned before thee; as it is written in the law of Moses, For on that day he shall make expiation for you to cleanse you from all your sins: before Yahweh ye shall be clean. And the priests and the people who were standing in the Temple-court, when they heard the ineffable name which was being uttered from the mouth of the High Priest, knelt and worshipped and fell down on their faces and said, Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever.'[1]

Whence and when came the part played by Azazel? For Azazel is not of the essence of the rite even of the scape-goat. It would be in accordance with numerous analogies for the goat to go merely into the solitary wilderness, without being assigned there to any divine or demonic person. It may be that *scape-goats* were used in ancient Israel, and that *Azazel* is none the less a relatively late addition to Jewish thought; and that as the rite of the scape-goat, so the person of Azazel was brought into

[1 Yoma 6[2].]

relation with an act of expiation proceeding from Yahweh with which they had originally nothing to do. The similarity of the name to those numerous names of the angels which, according to Jewish tradition itself, the Jews brought up from Babylon is great, and the etymological efforts that have been made to escape the significance of this similarity cannot be regarded as happy. Whether or not we accept in the precise form in which he presents it Cheyne's theory [1] that Azazel is a fallen angel substituted by the author of the ritual for the crowd of *se'irim* (or earth demons) to whom the people sacrificed, and that he was accordingly of literary not of popular origin, he is on safer ground in associating the Azazel of Lev. 16 with the Azazel of the Book of Enoch, and in general with a relatively late stage of Jewish theory, than is Orelli, for example, in attempting [2] to maintain that Azazel was a figure in the religion of Moses; Orelli's argument that at a later time Satan rather than Azazel would have been set over against Yahweh breaks down in view of the position occupied by Azazel in the Book of Enoch. That the ritual of Lev. 23 contains elements of great antiquity is, in the light of anthropological investigation, beyond question: that the practice of transferring sins or disease to animals was ancient in Israel is sufficiently probable; but it also remains probable that the particular combination of ritual contained in Lev. 23 and practised after the Exile is not early, but that we have here a priestly attempt to disarm inveterate popular practice by associating it with the worship of Yahweh and to secure recognition of the supremacy of Yahweh by clearly marking off the animal that carries the sins and the divine or demonic being who had become, but was not, perhaps, originally, associated with the ritual as merely subordinate agents in expiation and not the cause of it.

We may, in conclusion, attempt an estimate of the place occupied by the Day of Atonement in later Jewish life and thought.

It was but a single day in the year, whereas the other major festal days whose observance was required in the Law numbered nearly twenty; yet this one day in some respects played a larger part in the religious life and imposed itself more on Jewish thought than the great festal and joyous anniversaries. The Day occupies, moreover, a striking place in the calendar; coming

[1] *E.Bi.* Azazel. [2] *PRE* 'Versöhnungstag'.

between New Year's Day, on which, as early as the Mishnah at least, it was believed that men were judged and their destinies fixed by God for the year, and the great festival of the Ingathered Harvest with its gay and cheerful rites which began a fortnight later. The yearly expiation was thus able to add during the days of the festival to the joy of harvest the joy of recently forgiven sin. In the later Midrash it was the one day in the 365 of the year when Satan for three hours abstained from accusing Israel.

The Day of Atonement was marked, like other fixed seasons of the Ecclesiastical Calendar, by special public sacrifices in the Temple in addition to those offered daily; it thus appealed specially on this ground to all those, whether of Judea or of the Diaspora, to whom the thought of the due working of the sacrificial system at any time appealed; yet not on this ground more specially than other special days of the year; except indeed on this ground, that on this day the high priest in person discharged duties which on other days could be and were regularly discharged by an ordinary priest, and also performed certain rites which were alone performed even by him on this day. The kind of appeal that this could make to certain minds is familiarly illustrated by the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the earlier Jewish community was on this day not only specially engaged in and through its supreme representative, the high priest: but was also, in each of its individual members personally, a participant in the special rites of the day in virtue of the fast, and the sabbath rest, which all alike had to observe: the sabbath rest the day shared with the weekly sabbath; the rigid fasting from evening to evening it shared with the commemoration on the ninth of Ab of the destruction of the Temple: but the combination of fasting and sabbath rest was peculiar to the day, and the fasting itself was peculiar in that it was commemorative, as that of the ninth of Ab, but penitential or expiatory. In one other respect the day was unique in the Jewish year: on this day alone was the method of the scape-goat adopted in the interest of the whole community.

The heightened sacrificial solemnity of the day, the sabbath rest and the fast observed by every individual, the popular rite, so transparent in its meaning, of the scape-goat, continued to give

the Day a peculiarly vivid power and a unique place in the life and imagination of the Jews.

It is obvious that a very mechanical and unethical view of sin and forgiveness might be fostered by the day; if the danger of such an association always threatened and often befell the practice of expiatory sacrifice, which was conspicuous on this day, the danger was heightened by the association, on this day, of expiatory sacrifice with the ritual of the scape-goat. We have seen that it would be unfair to charge the framers of the law with a merely mechanical and unethical view of sin and forgiveness, overlooking the direct action in expiation which the law attributes to God. We have seen also that the confession given in the ritual of *Yoma* emphasizes and indeed alone takes account of God's part in expiation. But an allusion in the same Mishnah tract shows us, what we might in any case have expected, that many of the less instructed seized hold on the primitive and still strong significance of the scape-goat, and therefore, to make doubly sure that their sins would be carried away, unloaded their sins individually and directly on the goat. 'They constructed', we read in *Yoma* $6^4$, 'an easy path (כביש) for the goat on account of the Babylonians'; that by the Babylonians is meant the Alexandrine Jews, as the Gemara would have it, is altogether improbable; more probably it means the crowd, but we need not settle the point here, but merely mark the reason given for constructing the easy escape for the goat: for, the Mishnah continues, 'they used to tear out the goat's hair and say Take (viz. our sins) and begone, take and begone.' We may perhaps compare with this the statement in the Epistle of Barnabas $7^8$ that all the congregation spat upon the goat and pricked it. In this popular, as distinct from the solemn priestly Temple, treatment of the goat we may well have a survival of the ancient popular rites which the priesthood has attempted to purge; or, given a scape-goat, such treatment might not unnaturally originate afresh. In any case the action of the Jewish populace, and we may pretty safely add their thought of sin-transference, was closely similar to practices of sin and disease transference cited by Sir James Frazer, of which one may be quoted: 'In some parts of Breadalbane it was formerly the custom of New Year's Day to take a dog to the door, give him a bit of bread and drive him out, saying, "Get away, you dog!

Whatever death of men or loss of cattle would happen in this house to the end of the year, may it all light on your head."'[1]

In another respect the Day of Atonement was liable to foster in certain minds a view of expiation which neither the law nor its custodians intended. 'A man might say:[2] I will sin and the Day of Atonement will expiate my sin: but for such an one the Day of Atonement secures no expiation.' Again, the Day of Atonement might be regarded as acting so mechanically as to eliminate the need for reparation as between man and man: hence also the Mishnah: 'For sins between a man and his neighbour, it does not atone, until the man satisfy (ירצה) his neighbour.'

Every ritual of expiation, every symbol of forgiveness, every theory of atonement, is liable to abuse and to foster an unethical and unspiritual conception of God's attitude to sin; and it would not be difficult, were there time, to parallel from other religions such abuses as we have observed of the Jewish Day of Atonement, and also of such protests in favour of a more worthy one.

It remains to remark that while naturally the concentration of thought on the Day of Atonement, on sin and the need for its expiation, gave to the Day a sombre colour unlike the joy of the annual festivals, yet even this day led up to its own particular joy in the expiation accomplished. So perhaps we may account for that very remarkable custom, a survival, perhaps, from an earlier and different observance of the day, according to which, as on the tenth day of Ab of which we have spoken, the maidens of Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement went clad in white to dance in the vineyards.

On the Day of Atonement the expiatory rites of the Jewish sacrificial system culminate. If the conclusion is correct that the Day as described in Lev. 26 is a post-exilic institution, it will follow that in the later as contrasted with earlier religion, the sense of sin and the need for expiation were heightened, and with this an outlook on life in some respects less bright yet deeper secured. But expiatory rites were anything but a complete novelty in post-exilic religion; and in that religion right down to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the older festivals of joy, even if somewhat modified, maintained their place. It may be that in some modern presentations both the joyous side of pre-

[1] *The Scapegoat*, p. 209. [2] *Yoma* 8[9].

exilic and the sombre side of post-exilic religion have been over-emphasized. On this latter point I would conclude, summarizing this and previous lectures thus: In the Jewish religion, in the time of our Lord, the Day of Atonement with its stress on sin and expiation, with its fasting and solemn rest and inactivity, was the supreme day of the year: yet it was but one day; within the year some twenty days of full festival joy also occurred, and some forty other days were observed as happy memorials of the works which God had wrought, especially in relatively recent times, on behalf of His people. In any estimate of Jewish religious life in the time of our Lord these feasts should not be overlooked, nor their significance depreciated.

# XXI

## THE SHEAF

PASSOVER and Unleavened Bread had by the first century of our era become so closely and indissolubly connected that either name could be, and was, applied either to the whole of the festival week or to the first day of it, which was distinguished by the offering on it of the actual Paschal victim. But an examination of the earlier laws of the O.T. raises serious doubts whether this close association existed much, if any, earlier than the Exile. Before pursuing this question further and going forward to the meaning attached at different times to the familiar rites of the Paschal victim and the taboo on all that was leavened, it will be well to consider a third rite that was a sufficiently conspicuous feature of the festival week as long as the Temple stood, which has left its mark on the Jewish Liturgy in the ritual known as the Counting of the Omer, and which is observed from Easter or Passover to Whitsuntide or Pentecost, but which is less familiar to Christian students of the Bible. Whereas Passover and Unleavened Bread are referred to and even described with frequency both in the O.T. and in the N.T., the sheaf is mentioned, and that with brevity and some ambiguity, but once in the O.T. and never in the N.T. In compensation we have accounts of the practice in the first century of our era in Philo, who wrote before the destruction of the Temple, and Josephus, whose account was written less than twenty-five years after that event. In connexion with these a good deal of the detail in the Mishnah (*M n.* x.) may be accepted as genuine tradition preserving some vivid details of the practice in form prior to the destruction of the Temple.

I will first describe the practice of this period and draw attention to one or two questions raised by the accounts of it, and then turn back to the earlier and briefer account given in the Pentateuch.

Philo (*De Septen.* ii. 20), after describing Passover, the fourth festival of his scheme, and Unleavened Bread as the fifth, yet as he remarks combined (*συνάπτει*) with Passover, continues, 'there is also a festival—*ἑορτὴ*—which falls immediately after the first day of the festival (of Passover—'*Εορτὴ δὲ ἔστιν ἡ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην εὐθὺς ἡμέραν*), and this is called, on account of what takes place on it, *δράγμα* (the Sheaf). For this (sheaf) is brought to the altar as the aparche, both of the country which fell by lot to the (Jewish) nation separately, and of the whole race of mankind in common; the reason for this being, that as the priest is to the city, so is the Jewish people (*ἔθνος*) to the whole world (*οἰκουμένην*). . . . Now it has been shown how the sheaf is made an aparche both of our native land and of the whole earth in gratitude for abundant good harvests which both the (Jewish) nation and the whole human race desire to enjoy. It is also fitting not to overlook that many other useful ends are served by the aparche. Firstly, it is a memorial of God, than which it is impossible to find a more perfect good, and then it is a most perfect requital (*ἀμοιβή*) to the real cause of fertility. The sheaf of the aparche consists of barley.[1]

It will be convenient to note certain features here that are clear and unambiguous:

1. The offering is made on the second day of Passover, i.e. the 16th of Nisan. The day of the month is not indeed stated, and the phraseology, 'a festival which is immediately after the first day', may ultimately be due to the ambiguous phraseology in Lev. 23 which has given rise to so much discussion; at the same time Philo does not appear to be so much committing himself to a particular interpretation of a disputed phrase as stating the actual practice of his time.

2. The offering is of barley.

3. The word used by Philo, as also by Josephus, to describe the amount and character of the barley offered is *δράγμα*; though in later Greek usage this was scarcely confined to its earlier meaning of 'so many stalks of corn as can be grasped in the hand', a *small* bundle or sheaf was suitably expressed by it, and this appears to be the meaning of עמיר, the term used in the Mishnah.

[1 Mangey, ii. 294.]

in contradistinction to אלמה, the word used in Gen. 37[7] of the *large* sheaves of Joseph and his brothers.[1]

4. The offering is a communal offering, not the offering of an individual; it is primarily on behalf of the Jewish nation, indirectly, according to Philo's universalistic theology, on behalf of the whole human race.

The account of the ceremony given by Josephus is in the *Antiquities*, iii. 10[5], and is as follows:

'In the month Xanthicus, which is amongst us called Nisan... and on the fourteenth day by the moon (for in that month we were freed from enslavement to the Egyptians) it is ordained (ἐνόμισε) that we should every year sacrifice that sacrifice called Passover, which, as I have said, we sacrificed at the time of the Exodus from Egypt.... Then on the fifteenth day (of the month) the festival of Passover is succeeded by that of Unleavened Bread, lasting seven days, during which they feed on unleavened bread.... And on the second day of Unleavened Bread, being the sixteenth (of the month), they take of the produce which they have reaped, but which they have not previously touched. And deeming it right to honour God first, from whom they have obtained a good supply of this produce, they offer to him the aparche of the barley in the following manner: Having roasted the sheaf (τὸ δράγμα) of the ears of corn, and winnowed them, and having made the barley clean for grinding, they offer on the altar to God a tenth (of an ephah): and having cast a handful (δράγμα) on the fire, they leave the rest for the use of the priests. And then it is lawful for them publicly and privately to reap (their harvest). At the time of the aparche of the produce they sacrifice a ram as a burnt-offering.'

Thus Josephus as clearly as Philo indicates the second day of Unleavened Bread, i. e. the sixteenth of Nisan, as the *day* of the celebration, and barley as the *substance* of the offering. Of the quantity he also uses the term δράγμα. In the following respects he indicates additional or different elements of the ritual: (1) the sheaf is not presented *as such* at the altar, but the

[1] See Levy, s. v. כריכה. The LXX, however, renders both אלמה of Gen. and עמר of Lev. 23 by δράγμα.

ears of corn are rubbed out and roasted before presentation; (2) a part only of the barley is placed on the altar fire, the rest falls to the priests.

The tradition or interpretation embodied in the Mishnah, chiefly in *Me'n.* x., agrees with these details given by Josephus and gives further details. In part, at least, the details given in the Mishnah, from the way in which they are given, appear to be genuine tradition of past *practice*, and not mere speculative interpretation of the biblical *text*. In part the Mishnaic treatment of the subject obviously consists here, as often elsewhere, of divergent views of the meaning of the text of Scripture, and consequently of what ought to be the practice. One of these disputed points of practice turning on divergent interpretation of obscure phrases of Scripture was the day of the week and the day of the month on which the sheaf ought to be presented. The text of Scripture required the sheaf to be offered 'on the morrow after the sabbath' (ממחרת השבת)—an obscure phrase with regard to the meaning of which modern as well as ancient interpreters are at variance. According to the Sadducees, sabbath in this phrase means, as elsewhere in Scripture, the seventh day of the week: consequently the morrow of the sabbath was the first day of the week: consequently this sheaf ought in every year to be offered on the same day of the week, to wit the first, and necessarily therefore in different years on different days of the month. According to the Pharisees, 'the sabbath' in the phrase means exceptionally not the weekly sabbath, but the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread. Since this fell on a fixed day of the month, the fifteenth, the sheaf also was always offered on a fixed day of the month, viz. the sixteenth; necessarily, therefore, in different years it fell on different days of the week, sometimes on a sabbath, though, of course, more frequently on a week-day. Practice, if we may trust Philo and Josephus, in the first century A.D. followed the Pharisaic interpretation. But this raised points which the Sadducean interpretation escaped: how, for example, were the conflicting duties involved in fulfilling the law of the sheaf and observing the laws of the sabbath to be decided? On this conflict of duty and the dispute between the Sadducean and Pharisaic interpretation much of the Mishnah turns, but in such

a way, as I have already said, as to suggest that a good deal of the actual practice is incidentally preserved.

The discussion begins: R. Ishmael said, 'If the day of offering fall on a sabbath, the sheaf consisted of three measures, if on a week-day of five';[1] but the wise said alike on week-day and sabbath it consisted of three measures. R. Chanina סגן הכהנים said: 'On the sabbath it was reaped by one person, with one sickle, and put in one basket; on a week-day, by three persons, in three baskets, by three sickles'. The wise said: 'On sabbath and week-day alike by three in three baskets with three sickles.'

(3) The commandment of the crop required that it should be offered of crop grown in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; were this not ripe, it might be offered from crop of any place. It once happened that the sheaf was offered of crop grown at Gannoth Seriphim, and the two loaves of crops grown in the valley of En-Soker. What was the custom? Messengers of Beth-Din went out on the eve of the Festival, and of the still growing corn bound the required quantity (אתו) into כריכות (small sheaves, bundles, as much as can be grasped with the hand) that it might be the more easily reaped. And people from all the neighbouring towns came that the reaping of the sheaf might take place with as much pomp as possible. As soon as it was dark (as the fifteenth passes into the sixteenth of Nisan) the reaper said to them, 'Has the sun set?' They said, 'Yes'. 'Has the sun set?' They said, 'Yes'. '(With) this sickle?' They said, 'Yes'. '(With) this sickle?' They said, 'Yes'. '(Into) this basket?' They said, 'Yes'. '(Into) this basket?' They said, 'Yes'. On a sabbath day he said (further) to them, 'On this sabbath day?' They said, 'Yes'. 'On this sabbath day?' They said, 'Yes'. 'Shall I reap?' They said to him, 'Reap'. 'Shall I reap?' They said to him, 'Reap'. He repeated every question and they replied to every question, thrice. And why all this? On account of the Boethusaeans, for they said, 'The reaping of the Omer ought not to take place on the outgoing of the Festival'.

(4) (The sheaf) was reaped, put in a basket and brought to the Temple Court. They roasted it on the fire in order to fulfil

[1] The smaller quantity causing less work.

the law that it should be roasted (or parched) corn (קלי: Lev. $2^{14}$). According to R. Meir the roasting must be done while the corn is still in the ear,[1] but the wise said it should be beaten with reeds or green twigs (soft things like this) so that it should not be crushed, and that then the grains should be put on a perforated roasting pan (אבוב) with holes so that the fire might directly affect the whole. Then it was spread out in the court and the wind blew on it: it was put in a grain mill; and a tenth (of an ephah) was taken out which was winnowed with thirteen sieves, and the remainder was redeemed and eaten by anyone. . . . As for the tenth the priest approached it, added to it the requisite oil and frankincense, poured this out and mingled it, waved it, presented it, took a handful of it and burnt it (on the altar fire), and the remainder was eaten by the priests.

(5) When the sheaf had been offered, people went out and found the market-place in Jerusalem full of meal and parched corn: according to R. Meir this custom had not, according to R. Judah it had, the approval of the wise. After the sheaf had been offered (those who were in Jerusalem) were allowed (to eat) the new corn immediately, those who lived at a distance from midday onwards. After the destruction of the Temple R. Jochanan b. Zakkai ordained that during the whole day of הניף it should not be allowable (to eat it). . . . Why were those living at a distance allowed it from midday onwards? Because they knew that Beth Din would not be so careless (as not to offer it before that hour).

(6) (The offering of) the sheaf rendered (the produce of the new crop) lawful (for consumption) throughout the land; but the hot loaves (offered at Pentecost) (first rendered the use of the new crop for offerings) at the Temple (lawful).

(7) Wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye are subject to the law that the new produce may not be eaten before the Passover or reaped before the sheaf (has been reaped). (Nevertheless) artificially watered fields in the plains may be reaped, but the corn must not be heaped up (into shocks). . . . Again (growing corn) may be reaped and given as fodder to cattle . . . it may also be reaped in view of a secondary crop, to secure a place for

[1] Cp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. $10^5$.

a mourner, to avoid interference with a Beth Ham-midrash; but in these cases it must not be bound into sheaves (כריכות) but only into small bundles (צבתים). The commandment requires the sheaf to be offered from the standing corn; if such is not to be found (because the crop is already all reaped), it may be offered of corn that had already been cut and put up in sheaves. . . . The commandment requires the offering to be made of fresh (לח) corn: if such is not to be had, it may be offered of that which is dry. The commandment requires it to be cut in the night; yet if it be cut in the day it is valid; and (the duty of reaping the sheaf) overrides the law of the sabbath.

These elaborate regulations of the Rabbis apply to an ancient rite which is in the O.T. described in only one passage, Lev. $23^{10-14}$, and there briefly. In part the regulations are governed by changing circumstances, in part by subtilties of interpretation and the association with this passage of others (Lev. $2^{11}$ and Dt. $26^{1-11}$) which really have little or nothing to do with it. An examination of the Rabbinic treatment here gives some instructive illustrations of the way in which the original meaning of sacrificial custom, even where it had survived long among the people, was gradually eliminated without, so far as can be seen, the substitution[1] of any fresh meaning clearly held or taught beyond the general and fundamental fact that the sacrificial regulations were divine commandments, and on that ground, apart from any perception of their meaning, were to be observed. The law in Lev., so far as it refers to the peculiar observance of the sheaf, was as follows:

'When you have come into the land which I am giving you and reap the harvest of it, you shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest to the priest; and he shall wave the sheaf before Yahweh that you may be accepted: on the day following the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And you shall eat neither bread nor roasted grain, nor early ears, until that very day, until you have brought the offering of your God.'

So we read in Lev. $23^{10, 11, 14}$: the intervening verses merely provide for the offering, at the same time as the sheaf, of a sheep

[1] By the Rabbis; cf. Philo

and the normal accompaniments of meal, oil, and wine: in these there is nothing peculiar; they merely prescribe one of the animal sacrifices which form so conspicuous and monotonous a feature in the late ritual legislation of the O.T. With the sheaf it is different: it stands in certain respects unique among the altar rites of the Jews; the rite and its effect can be classified and easily classified: but other rites of the same class are not Jewish; they are alien. This rite is one of those that have been most illuminated by anthropology and the comparative study of religion. Its original meaning, up to a certain point, is in no way obscure: uncertainty only begins when we consider the extent to which that original meaning was consciously maintained, or was transformed, or was simply lost.

The law of the sheaf stands in the ritual calendar of the Priestly Code; but it was taken over into that Code, being amplified in the process, especially in regard to the offering of the lamb, from the Law of Holiness. Into the details of analysis as between H and P it is unnecessary to enter here;[1] even H as a code is no older than the sixth century B.C., but the rite which is here first, and alone in the O.T., recorded is much more ancient. We note:

(1) That the ritual of the Sheaf is strictly the ritual of an agricultural community. It had no part in the religion of the Hebrews before their entrance into Canaan: it probably became part of their ritual as soon as they were well established as cultivators of the soil of Canaan. It is interesting to observe that the calendar itself recognizes that this ritual must have been first exercised after the settlement: like all the others, the actual ordinance is in this case too referred to Moses; but whereas it is said of other festivals such as the Passover, the Day of Atonement, &c., that they are to be observed on such and such a day in the calendar without regard to places or circumstances, of the offering of the sheaf it is said—'When you have come into the land which I am giving you . . . you shall bring a sheaf,' &c.

(2) Of the details of the ritual, Lev. says little. The sheaf (עמר) is to be brought to the priest, and he is to wave it before

[1] Probably 10, 11, 14a (except 'until that very day'), is H: $12^{2}$, 13, 14b, P. Rather differently C. and H. and Dr.

Yahweh, i. e. at the altar. The obvious meaning of the phrase והניף את העמר is that the sheaf itself was waved at the altar: and the abandonment of this earlier custom in favour of presenting at the altar the grains separated from the ears, of which both Josephus and the Mishnah speak, can perhaps be accounted for. Of the destiny of the sheaf after it had been waved the law says nothing; but in view of the destiny of most objects that were waved before the altar[1] we may infer that the sheaf fell to the priests as Yahweh's proxies; such is the practice described in the Mishnah, except that a handful of the grain was burnt on the altar. If, indeed, some part of the harvest is to be offered to the gods or spirits, a custom which rested *ultimately* on the belief that the gods fed, like men, on the produce of the earth, with the weakening or disappearance of this idea, much of what had once been offered to the gods becomes a mere fee, paid without religious ceremony, to their representatives the priests; such was the tithe of later Judaism and the *t'rûmah* (*Numbers*, p. 225). But in the case of certain small quantities, the idea that the grain was given, in the first instance at least, direct to Yahweh affected even the ritual: the sheaf was solemnly waved or swung in front of and towards the altar for Yahweh's acceptance, and in the ritual of the *bikkurim* or firstfruits described in the Mishnah, the produce presented as firstfruits by the individual grower was placed on the altar (*Bik.* $3^6$; *Numbers*, p. 228).

The difference between the sheaf of Lev. $23^{10-14}$ *in its present setting and in the Mishnah* and the firstfruits described in Num. $18^{13}$ and Mishnah, *Bik.*, lies especially in the fact that the sheaf was a communal offering (קרבן העבור), the bikkurim individual offerings (קרבן היחיד). The offering of the sheaf releases the whole land, all Jews living near or far, from the taboo on the new produce; all the neighbouring towns, as we have seen, streamed out to see the sheaf cut, and, relying on a punctual discharge of the ritual, Jews living remote from Jerusalem felt at liberty to eat the new produce after midday on the 16th of Nisan, the day of the presentation. Such a communal

[1] *Numbers*, p. 224. Cp., e. g., Lev. $7^{30}$ (the breast of the peace-offering), Num. $8^{11\,ff.}$ (the Levites). Quite exceptionally what had first been waved was burnt *entire* on the altar (Exod. $29^{24\,f.}$) or in part (Num. $5^{25}$).

offering affecting the whole of Jewry, at a later date even the Jews of the Diaspora (?) as well as of the homeland, presupposes a strongly centralized religious life and is not readily accounted for after the Deuteronomic Reformation. Prior to that the offerings that released the harvest from the taboo were presumably made at local altars and affected the surrounding districts only; Jerusalem, which may previously have been the centre of a large district, became by the reform the only centre for the whole land.[1]

But the sheaf differed from the bikkurim further in this: that it was offered at the very commencement of harvest, thereby releasing for consumption *by the harvesters* of the crop they were reaping, the bikkurim were not. The solemn treatment of the first ears to be reaped of the new crop may rest ultimately on the idea that the corn spirit actually inhabits the corn, but of this idea no trace survives, apart from the taboo, even in the earliest Hebrew record of the rite. Even the Mishnah is a little ambiguous with regard to the extent of the taboo: was the *consumption* only of the new crops, or was the *reaping* of them also forbidden till the sheaf of firstfruits had been solemnly reaped? The severer taboo would most fully perpetuate the effect of the ancient conception.

It is curious that a rite so closely associated with a certain stage in the growth of the crops, and dependent upon this stage having been reached for its due fulfilment, should have been fixed to a particular date in the calendar; yet later Jewish practice (Josephus, Philo, Mishnah) fixed it for the fifteenth day of Nisan, and the differing Sadducean *theory* fixed it within a week, i. e. for the Sunday falling between the fifteenth and twenty-second of Nisan.[2] In fixing the offering of the sheaf for a particular

[1] Analogous to this centralization is the Athenian state festival of the Proerosia with a certain *world-wide* (cp. Philo on the sheaf) significance: Frazer, *Corn and the Wild*, 50 f.

[2] Yet a third theory, which has governed the practice of the Falashes, fixed the sabbath involved for the *last* day of Passover week, which equally with the first day was a day of solemn assembly and abstinence from servile work (Num. 28). The sheaf on this theory was offered on the 22nd of Nisan. According to Charles, this theory is implied in Jub. $15^1$, which fixes Pentecost for the 15th of the third month, i. e. 15 + 28 + 7 days after Nisan 22.

date in the calendar, did later Jewish practice agree with, or differ from, more ancient practice?

The answer to this question turns in part on the question whether 'the morrow after the sabbath' of Lev. 23 was a fixed day, and in part on the degree to which later Jewish practice shows signs of accommodation.

Lev. 23 describes, as we have already remarked, two peculiar offerings: the offering of a sheaf of firstfruits of barley on 'the day after the sabbath', and the offering of two loaves prepared from the new corn (wheat) of the season *seven* weeks later. The beginning and the end of this period of seven weeks are evidently intimately connected; and in relation to one another the presentation of the sheaf and of the two loaves were fixed. But was the beginning of this season, and consequently the end of it, always fixed, as later it was, by the calendar? Did it always begin on the sixteenth of Nisan and end fifty days later?

While the *rites* of the sheaf and the two loaves are mentioned only in P, this *period* of seven weeks is also mentioned elsewhere: certainly in Dt. $16^{9}$, 'Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee: from the time that thou beginnest to put in the sickle into the standing corn shalt thou begin to number seven weeks. And then thou shalt keep the feast of *Shābu'oth* unto Yahweh thy God'. The term *Shābu'oth* is commonly rendered 'weeks', a view which has been called in question by Grimme (*Das israelitische Pfingstfest und der Pleiadenkult*), who interprets it as the feast of the seven (stars)—the Pleiades, seeing in the midsummer feast one that was originally not agricultural but astronomical in character. If the חג השבעות is correctly rendered 'Feast of Weeks' and explained as meaning the feast at the termination of the seven weeks of harvest, then the existence of this period of seven weeks, ending at least with a festival, is also attested by the reference to the Feast of Weeks in Ex. $34^{22}$; yet even so it is not universally admitted that the clause containing this term is original to the laws of J. But even confining ourselves to Dt. and H we may safely assume that at the end of the seventh century the institution was already ancient.

Thus neither of the laws—that of H and that of D—which refer to the festival at the end of seven weeks defines by a calendral date the beginning of that period. On the other hand,

Dt. quite definitely defines the beginning of that period by an agricultural process, to wit the reaping of the first corn of the season. The meaning of Lev., though less clear on the point, is also probably that the period coincided with the first reaping; in addition, it defines the first day of the period as 'the day after the sabbath', and this, as we have seen, has been interpreted as referring either to the second day of, or to the Sunday that falls in, the Passover week. Against this view that the law itself meant the second day of Passover, as Pharisaical theory and Jewish practice in the first century A. D. took it to mean, there are two powerful arguments: (1) if the law meant the second day of Passover, no satisfactory explanation can be offered why it did not say so clearly; nor is the custom of counting fifty days from one day to another likely to have arisen where the first day was a fixed date in the calendar; not even though we admit that fifty days after Nisan 16th may have varied between the fifth, sixth, and seventh of Siwan (*Di.*, p. 590) owing to the varying lengths of the lunar months; (2) The law defines not only the day of the sheaf as 'the day after the sabbath', but also the day, some weeks later, on which the two loaves were offered—עד ממחרת השבת השביעית (Lev. $23^{16}$). Even if against all analogy we could admit that 'the day after the sabbath' on which the sheaf was offered was not the day after a weekly sabbath, but the day after the first day of Unleavened Bread ranking as a sabbath, 'the day after the seventh sabbath' cannot be thus explained; it can only mean 'the Sunday'; Pentecost, according to the law, from which, for reasons which we cannot follow, later practice departed, always fell on a Sunday: consequently the day of the sheaf, seven weeks earlier, always fell on a Sunday.

Did this Sunday originally fall within the same week by the calendar? Was the sheaf of barley offered in the earliest period, if not as in later practice, on the sixteenth of Nisan, yet always between the fifteenth and twenty-second of Nisan? Did the harvest keep so consistently to the calendar that a sheaf of new barley was always ready for presentation between the fifteenth and twenty-second of Nisan (April) and flour from the new wheat seven weeks later?

The fixed date is an inference, and superficially at least not an unreasonable inference, from not the wording but the position of

the law. The law itself simply says that 'on the day after the sabbath' the sheaf shall be presented, without further defining the sabbath, though some further definition seems to be needed. Immediately before the law, however, stands in Leviticus the law of Passover and Unleavened Bread defining the observances by dates of the month. The inference commonly drawn is that the sabbath day of the sheaf fell within the Passover week. Some support for this view has recently been sought in anthropology. Since Passover was eaten at the full moon, on any day in the following week the moon is on the wane. Now folk-custom in certain places requires reaping to be carried on, or at least begun, with the waning moon.[1]

On the other hand, if the law in its original form meant the Sunday in Passover week it would have been easy to express this. Dt. omits all reference to the sheaf, possibly because the Reformers were out of sympathy with the taboo which it removed; but in defining the harvest festival seven weeks later they define the beginning of the period not by Passover, which has just been mentioned and regulated, which again it would have been easy to mention, but as the time when harvest was begun: 'from the time when thou first puttest in the sickle to the standing corn, thou shalt begin to count seven weeks.'

If the solemn offering of the first sheaf of barley-harvest originally varied as to calendral date according to the forwardness or backwardness of the season, but later came to be observed on a fixed date in the calendar, certain difficulties giving rise to corresponding accommodations would arise. Doubtless the sheaf could be offered, at need, in a greater or less stage of maturity; and throughout the country there was a large range in any year in the dates at which the barley matured. But even so a fixed date caused difficulties, and the accommodations which they called forth are recorded in the Mishnah.

The risk of the barley not being ready was greater than that of its being overripe by the fifteenth of Nisan. To some extent this difficulty could be met by intercalation; if by the middle of the last month of the year, i.e. the month immediately preceding Nisan, it seemed improbable that the crops would be ripe in

[1] Eerdmans, *Alttest. Stud., Leviticus*, iv. 114.

three or four weeks' time, the last month could be repeated as an intercalary month—second Adar. Yet there were limits to this; if two or three late seasons succeeded one another, intercalary months could not be inserted in all these years, and the Talmud definitely lays down that the position of the sun must be the dominant consideration in determining intercalation. Failing the adjustment of the seasons by intercalation, the law of the sheaf could only be fulfilled with barley obviously immature, and this would really be no fulfilment of the obvious intention of the law, which requires the offering to be made of the *harvest*. The difficulty of an exceptionally early harvest is also contemplated in the Mishnah: it is recognized that the sheaf ought to be cut straight away for the purpose from the standing and as yet otherwise unreaped harvest; if the season is so early that it is all already cut before the sixteenth of Nisan, the Mishnah allows the offering to be made with barley taken from the shocks in the field: 'The commandment requires the sheaf to be offered of the standing corn: if none such is available, it may be offered from the sheaves (in the field).'[1] Accommodation to seasonal facts had to be found, but this accommodation in particular disregarded the law of Deut. 16 that the fifty days to Pentecost should begin with the *beginning* of the reaping of the barley.

Taken by themselves, the law of the Sheaf and the two loaves in Lev. and the law of Pentecost in Dt. do not in the least suggest that the period of fifty days either began or ended on a fixed calendral date; *later* Jewish law shows that *then* existing Jewish custom had fixed each of these times, but also that this had necessitated accommodations that do not readily fit the fundamental purpose of the rite of the Sheaf. The most probable conclusion still remains, therefore, that of Wellhausen,[2] in spite of the criticism to which it has been subjected of late, especially by Eerdmans. Early custom freed the harvest from taboo by offering or sacrifice of the *first reaped* sheaf, which was naturally cut at different dates in different seasons; later Jewish custom, in establishing or universalizing a fixed calendar, fixed this rite also for a particular day of a particular month, and found itself in consequence compelled to meet the practical difficulties that arose as best it could.

[1] *M°n.* 10°. [2] *History of Israel*, ET, pp. 86 ff.

# XXII

## THE PASCHAL VICTIM

THE Spring Festival was marked by three peculiar features: the abstention from leavened bread throughout the whole festival week, the offering of the barley sheaf, and the ritual of the Paschal victim. In the practice of the first century A. D. the barley sheaf, as we have seen, was offered on the second day of the festival week, the 16th day of Nisan; opinion or theory, it is true, was still divided as to whether that was the particular day of the Festival on which the offering ought to be made, though there was no opinion even, still prevalent, in favour of a complete dissociation of the offering of the barley sheaf from the week of Unleavened Bread such as may have originally existed. The ritual of the Paschal victim, like that of the barley sheaf, was limited to a single day; it is possible, and even probable, that the Paschal ritual and the week of Unleavened Bread were also originally distinct, but there is no difference of opinion that, once they were united, the ritual of the Paschal victim formed the opening ceremonies of the festal week. At a period when all was fixed by the calendar, the festal week lasted from the afternoon of the 14th Nisan to sundown on the 21st; the Paschal ritual was completed within the sixteen or seventeen hours between the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan and sunrise on the 15th.

The first noticeable feature, then, about the Paschal celebration is that it was a *night* celebration. In the first century A. D. the *slaughter* indeed of the Paschal victim took place during the last three hours *before* sunset.[1] But it is by no means clear that the performance of even so much of the sacred ritual by daylight was in accordance with ancient custom. P requires the slaughter to take place בין הערבים (Ex. $12^6$), an ambiguous expression. It means literally 'between the two evenings'; on the determination of what the writer meant by this expression turns the

[1] Jos. *B. J.* vi. $9^3$: 'from the 9th to the 11th hour.' Cp. $P^{es}$s. $5^1$ implying from $8\frac{1}{2}$ onwards, 3 (invalid if slain before midday).

question of the *theory* of P regarding the hour of slaughter. The interpretations that have divided commentators as they formerly divided those who had to harmonize existing practice with the letter of Scripture are mainly two: according to one the second evening of the phrase was actual sunset, the first evening began either when the sun passed the meridian,[1] or when it had sunk half-way from the meridian to the horizon; according to the second interpretation the *first* evening was actual sunset, the second was the end of twilight when the stars came out. Obviously the first of these interpretations places an exceedingly forced sense on the word ערב which etymologically at least meant definitely sun*set*. The usage of the phrase in P favours the conclusion that the writer did not use it in this forced sense; for the same phrase defines (Ex. 30[8]) the time at which the tabernacle lights were kindled, and for this the obviously appropriate time would be just after sundown and before it became dark.[2] And over against the fact that the Jewish *practice* of the first century A. D. was to slaughter before, and indeed some hours before, sunset, we must set the fact that Samaritan practice down to the present day is to slaughter after sunset.[3] Consequently the practice of *one* of the two communities governed by the Pentateuch and particularly by P has departed from the original meaning of the law that slaughter was to take place 'between the two evenings'; since there is no record in either case of when this departure took place, or what led to it, we might infer, even if no other considerations pointed to the same conclusion, that Jewish practice, which required to justify it the more artificial explanation of the phrase 'between the two evenings', was secondary, and Samaritan practice, which agreed with the more obvious meaning, was the perpetuation of ancient practice.

So far I have spoken of Jewish practice in this matter in the

[1] שחטו קודם לחצות פסול שנאמר בין הערבים Pes. 5[3] *πάσχα . . . ἐν ᾗ θύουσι . . . ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἄχρι ἑσπέρας* Philo, *De. Septen.* 18 (Mangey, ii. p. 292).

[2] Cp. also of the quails ויהי בערב ותעל השלו . . . בין הערבים תאכלו בשר. (Ex. 16[12 f.])

[3] See, e. g., Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 38; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i. 461 f.

first century A. D.: but if the Book of Jubilees is rightly referred to the close of the first century B. C. the theory on which the practice rested, if not the practice itself, would appear to run back to that date. Jubilees requires the Paschal victim to be slain 'before it is even' (49[1]); not 'during any period of the light, but during the period bordering on evening' (49[12]), and this is explained again in these words: 'Let the Children of Israel come and observe the Passover on the day of its fixed time, on the fourteenth day of the first month, between the evenings from the third part of the day to the third part of the night, for two portions of the day are given to the light and a third portion to the evening.' In spite of the curious phraseology, the intention of the writer seems plain: the ritual of the Paschal victim begins when two-thirds of the daylight of the fourteenth of Nisan have passed, i. e. at about two o'clock in the afternoon; [1] elsewhere it is expressly laid down that the *eating* of the victim is to be from sunset onwards (v.[1]).

The interest of the reference in Jubilees lies here: that book requires the victim to be eaten, not, as was the practice in the first century, in the houses of Jerusalem, but in the *Temple* court (v.[16]); yet the number of Jews gathered to Jerusalem for Passover at the end of the first century B. C. must have been greatly less than in the first century A. D. But for this we might with more confidence find a reason for the shifting back of the act of slaughter from sundown to the afternoon in the greater crowds requiring to have their victims duly slain in the Temple and thence carried home in time for eating soon after sundown. Such a cause would at no time have been operative in Shechem, partly because the Paschal meal is still, and apparently always has been, except under stress of persecution, eaten where it was slain on Mt. Gerizim; and the numbers gathered to Shechem can never have been very great, and are now of course exceedingly small.

Even if the phrase 'between the evenings' used by P to define the time of slaughter of the Paschal victim be really obscure, and

[1] Yet again v.[19] is curious: 'slay the Passover in the evening, at sunset, at the third part of the day'. Are we in Jubilees at the beginning of an attempt to justify an artificial interpretation which has not yet, or has but recently, been allowed to govern practice?

not simply obscured by a perverse interpretation invented to bring it into harmony with the practice, the definition of time in Dt. ($16^6$) is too clear even for misinterpretation to obscure it. The slaughter is to take place 'in the evening, at sunset', בערב כבוא השמש.

Earlier laws do not define the hour of slaughter. Passing from this particular first element in the ritual, it merely needs to be recalled that the *consumption* of the victim in all laws and in the practice of all times lies between sundown and sunrise. It must begin after sundown: on this Jubilees, which contemplates earlier *slaughter*, is already explicit ($49^1$): 'The commandment that the Lord commanded . . . that they should eat it by night on the evening of the fifteenth from the hour of the setting of the sun.' It must be complete before sunrise: 'The sacrifice of the feast of the Passover shall not be left until the morning' (Ex. $34^{25}$ with variant omitting Passover and referring to the *fat* only in $23^{18}$): 'naught of the flesh shall remain unto the morning' (Dt. $16^4$): 'Ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning: that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire' (Ex. $12^{10}$ P). Led by that powerful principle of 'hedging the law', the Rabbinic law required the flesh to be consumed by midnight: 'after midnight the Passover defiles the house' (P$^e$s. x. 9a). 'Whatever must be eaten the same day is legally (i.e. by the strict law of Scripture) permissible till dawn on the next. If so, why have the wise said, Till midnight? In order to keep men from transgression' (B$^e$r. $1^1$). Jubilees, a forerunner of the Mishnaic Rabbis, required the meal to be over and the victim consumed by 10 o'clock at night ($49^{12}$): 'Let them eat it at the time of the evening till the third part of the night, and whatever is left over of the flesh from the third part of the night let them burn it with fire'.[1]

The night character of the festival is expressed in a striking if

[1] Cp. the Samaritan practice: 'It was not till after midnight that the announcement was made that the feast was about to begin. The Paschal moon was still bright and high in the heaven . . . the actual feast was consumed in rapid silence . . . in ten minutes all was gone but a few remnants. . . . The fire was again lit, and a huge bonfire kindled . . . and these fragments of flesh and bone were thrown upon the burning mass.' Stanley, i. 442–4. 'Cooked for midnight but ready and eaten before.' Thomson in *PEFQuSt*, 1902, pp. 82–92.

not altogether clear passage in Ex. $12^{42}$, which may perhaps be best rendered: 'It was a night of vigil (שמרים) kept by Yahweh in order to bring them out of Egypt'; which means that this night of Yahweh's is a vigil (שמרים) to be kept by the children of Israel throughout their generations.

We may with some certainty conclude that the night character of Passover is one of its most ancient and original features.

But on what sort of night was Passover kept? According to the law of P at least, and all later practice, as well Samaritan as Jewish, Passover was observed on the night of the full moon. P requires the Passover to be eaten on the night with which the fifteenth of the month commences, which, since the months were lunar, was the night of the full moon. The coincidence of Passover with full moon is not only noted but allegorized by Philo.[1] 'The feast', he remarks, 'is midmonthly, beginning on the fifteenth when the moon is full of light, through a providential arrangement that there shall be no darkness on that day, but that everything should be throughout full of light, the sun shining from dawn to eve, and the moon from eve to dawn.' *De Septen.* 19 (Mangey, ii. 293). Cp. *De Vita Mosis*, iii. 29, 30 (Mangey, ii. 169) (on second Passover). In the *De Congressu*, 19 (Mangey, i. 534) Philo allegorizes the fact that on the tenth day of the month, when the Paschal victim had to be chosen, the moon was two-thirds full, and on the fifteenth, when the victim was eaten, the moon was full.

The full-moon character of the feast appears to have influenced the law ($P^8$) of second Passover. Those who were prevented from observing Passover at the right time, owing to uncleanness from the dead and some other causes, were allowed to keep it subsequently, not, however, immediately they were ritually clean, but exactly one month later—on the fourteenth day of the month between the evenings (Num. $9^{11}$); in other words, at the time of the next full moon.

The full moon at which the Passover was slain was that which followed the Spring Equinox, or was nearest to the Spring

[1] Though elsewhere to extract an allegorical significance from $14 = 7 \times 2$ he speaks as though Passover were the feast of the 14th day: ἄγεται γὰρ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη, *De Septen.* 18 (Mangey, ii. 292); cp. with citation on p. 338.

Equinox. This is certain for the observance in the first century A. D. Into the complicated question of the Jewish calendar it is impossible to enter fully here; it must suffice to recall that from the second century B. C. onwards (Enoch and Jubilees) we have discussions of methods of intercalation designed to correct the difference between the lunar and the solar year; and that in the first century A. D. we have definite statements that the date of Passover depended on the sun as well as on the moon: Josephus observes that it is celebrated 'in the month . . . Nisan . . . on the fourteenth day of the lunar month . . . when the sun is in Aries' (*Ant.* iii. 10[5])—in other words, after the Spring Equinox; similarly Philo describes the Passover month as being the feast *κατὰ τὸν ἡλιακὸν κύκλον* (*De Septen.* 19, Mangey, ii. 293); Moses records (*ἀναγράφει*) it as *τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἰσημερίας* (*De Vit. Mos.* iii. 29, Mangey, ii. 169): and the festival weeks of the year take place *κατὰ τὰς τοῦ ἔτους ἰσημερίας, ἐαρινὴν καὶ τὴν μετοπωρινήν* (*De Dec.* 30, Mangey, ii. 206). For the relation of the Passover to the Spring Equinox we have at second hand a yet earlier testimony: Anatolius in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 32[16–18] appeals to the Jewish Alexandrian philosopher Aristobulus for the assertion that Passover must fall *after* the Spring Equinox.[1] As against this converging evidence that the year must be intercalated so as to secure that Passover fall after the Equinox, it is curious to find in Hebrew sources the sun enumerated as only *one* of the reasons for intercalation and in itself insufficient. 'On account of three things intercalation takes place: the ears of corn (האביב), the fruit of trees, and the circuit (of the sun = תקופה): on account of any two of these three things intercalation takes place, on account of one of them alone it does not.' (Tosef. *Sanh.* ii. and *Sanh.* 10[b]. 11[ab]: Levy, iii. 611: Schürer, i. I. ii. 366.) This seems plain; but it has to be remembered that it is later than the Jewish Greek evidence cited; and fails to take account of another ground given by Rabban Gamaliel (*c.* A. D. 130) in a letter giving grounds to the Jews in Babylon for the decision of the Palestinian authorities to intercalate a particular year: 'because the lambs are still tender and the birds not yet plump enough, and because the time of ripe ears has not yet come it has seemed good to me and my colleagues to add to the

[1] Schürer, I. ii. 366.

year thirty days'. (T. J. *Sanh.* 18[bcd] and Dalman, *Dialektproben*, p. 3). Yet this letter equally ignores the Equinox. Yet in spite of these Rabbinic decisions we, on the strength of the Jewish Greek evidence, infer that the Passover was fixed with regard to the Equinox, that generally at least it coincided with the full moon immediately after the Equinox, though if regard were had to some of the causes alleged in the Rabbinic sources it may, perhaps, have coincided at times with the full moon before the Equinox. In later times it always fell in the month Nisan; and Nisan is the later name for Abib, and according to Deut. 16[1] Passover must fall in Abib—the month named after ripening ears, which, according to the Rabbis, were one of the factors in deciding whether intercalation in any given year was required or not. Since barley ripens normally within the equinoctial month, we may, in view also of the stress laid upon the point later, infer that Deuteronomy in recognizing Abib as the Passover month is but perpetuating, as in so many other things, an ancient practice of its day which observed Passover at the next full moon after, or occasionally, perhaps, in consequence of faulty intercalation, at the full moon before the Spring Equinox. Earlier than Deuteronomy we have no direct evidence as to the exact time of the year at which the Paschal victim was offered; but the stress which was laid on its connexion with the full moon and the Vernal Equinox is a strong reason, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, for concluding that from a remote antiquity Passover was observed at the same time, reckoned by the moon and the sun, as it certainly was later. In other words, the fixing of *Passover* to a specific date in the calendar was no late innovation: since we saw reasons for believing the contrary with regard to the offering of the Sheaf, the probability is that the fixed relation of Sheaf and Passover to one another which obtained in later times did not obtain in earlier times, and that the offering of the Sheaf may often in those earlier times have been separated even by weeks from the sacrifice of the Paschal victim. And this is on other grounds a sufficiently probable conclusion: the Sheaf is the offering of an *agricultural* and not of a nomadic community; the Paschal victim, a slain animal, though it could be, and was, offered after the Hebrews became agriculturalists, is an equally natural offering for a nomadic community: and to the nomadic

period of Hebrew history the custom of offering the Paschal victim in all probability goes back, as the biblical narratives not obscurely assert. When on their entrance into Canaan the Hebrews added to their custom of offering a Paschal victim at the new moon next the Spring Equinox that of offering a sheaf at the beginning of barley harvest, it is altogether improbable that they at first associated closely in time these two offerings of so different origin and significance.

From the season and time at which the Paschal victim was slain, we pass to the nature of the victim. And here we must first observe that the popular phrase 'the Paschal lamb' is very misleading. In the course of centuries the range of choice in selecting a Paschal victim varied, but at no period was it limited to lambs or even to sheep.

There are three points to consider: (1) the kind, (2) the age, and (3) the sex of the animal.

The earliest definitions of the kinds from which the Paschal victim is chosen occurs in Dt. $16^{2}$: and this definition is a wide one: oxen, sheep, and goats are equally valid.[1] In other words, any kind of animal that was normally offered for any form of sacrifice could be offered as Passover: the only animals ever offered for sacrifice not permissible under the law of D for Passover were the doves and pigeons which were under certain circumstances admitted as a kind of attenuated animal sacrifice (Lev. $5^{7}$); but these were intended not, like the Paschal victim, for human consumption, but for the altar fire (Lev. 1), or for certain peculiar rites of purification (Lev. $12^{6,8}$, $14^{4f.,22,49f.}$, $5^{7}$, $12^{6,8}$, $15^{14-29}$, Num. $6^{10}$: cp. also $15^{9ff.}$). That this wide choice of victim was permitted by D in accordance with what was ancient custom in his day is probable: and if the sacrifice for which Moses pleaded that the Israelites might leave Egypt for the wilderness was Passover, the recognition of all three of the principal domestic beasts as possible Paschal victims lies perhaps behind the narrative of J: against Pharaoh's partial permission Moses urges: 'We must go . . . with our flocks and with our herds, for we must hold a feast unto Yahweh' (Ex. $10^{9}$).

[1] צאן ובקר, E.V. 'Of the flock and the herd', avoiding here its more frequent but inadequate equivalent of 'sheep' for צאן.

In P a limitation is fixed: the Paschal victim may still be taken from the sheep or the goats, but no permission to select from the oxen is given. Owing to the fact that English has no term by which to render the Hebrew *seh*, it is impossible to render the law in P (Ex. $12^{3-5}$, cp. $12^{21}$) at once accurately and without clumsiness. E.V., sacrificing accuracy, renders by 'lamb', the R.V. correcting the inaccuracy by adding as a marginal note 'or kid'. For our present purpose it will be better to be accurate at the expense of clumsiness; 'head of small cattle' would be an accurate rendering, since *seh* denotes a single animal of those, viz. sheep or goats, covered by the collective term *ṣôn*; but to bring out the relation of P to D, which latter code uses the collective terms *ṣôn* and *bākār*, rendered in A.V. 'flock' and 'herd' respectively, it will be better to render by 'one of the flock'. D leaves the choice open as between the flock and the herd. P confines the choice to the flock, but leaves it open as between the two constituents of the flock, viz. sheep and goats. P's law runs thus: 'They shall take to them every man one of the flock, according to their fathers' houses, one of the flock for a household; and if the household be too little for (i. e. to eat the whole of) one of the flock, then shall he and his neighbour next to his house take one according to the number of the souls: according to every man's eating ye shall make your reckoning for (i. e. in making your choice) the one (chosen out) of the flock. Your one (chosen) from the flock shall be without blemish, a male a year old; ye may take it from the sheep or from the goats.'[1]

The choice thus left open in P continues open to the last: it was a choice that was exercised in the first century[2] of our era, no less than five centuries before. 'If', we read in P$^{e}$s. $8^{2}$, 'any one says to his servant, Go out and slay the Passover for me, whether his servant slay a kid or a lamb, he may eat it: but if the servant slay both a kid and a lamb, he eats the first (i. e. the kid is used as the actual Paschal victim). If the servant forgets his master's directions (as to the kind of animal to be offered), what must he do? He must slay both a kid and a lamb and say: If my master said a kid, the kid for him and the lamb

[1 Ex. $12^{3-5}$.]

[2] For an intervening testimony see 2 Chron. $35^{7}$; for a discussion as to whether sheep were superior to goats see *Aʿrithoth* $6^{9}$.

for me; and if my master said to me a lamb, the lamb for him and the kid for me.'

The decision taken by itself might suggest that the goat was the more common Paschal victim. This was hardly the case. On the other hand, the statement frequently repeated to the effect that 'later usage declared in favour of the lamb',[1] if by this is meant that the goat had ceased to be a Paschal victim, appears to run beyond the evidence, if any evidence is given by those who make it, though often none[2] at all is added.

It is not improbable that in the first century A. D. the victims were more often taken from the sheep than from the goats, but beyond this the evidence adduced certainly does not carry us. Theodoret (*Quaest.* 24 in Ex.[3]) explains: 'He that hath a sheep (*πρόβατον*), let him slay it, he that hath not, a kid (*ἔριφον*)': and it is urged that he is here giving Jewish tradition; this may be so, but even so it only proves that sheep are the class from which the Paschal victim was more usually taken. Again, stress has been laid on the fact that the Greek version renders שה in the command, 'They shall take to them a שה' in Ex. 12[3] by *πρόβατον*, and that *πρόβατον*, or much more rarely some other word indicating a sheep, occurs elsewhere nearly forty times as an equivalent of שה, which on the other hand is in only one place rendered by a Greek term denoting a goat (Dt. 14[4]). But the second of these facts seems to nullify what might have been the significance of the first. If elsewhere the LXX regularly rendered שה by, say, *ποίμνιον*, and exceptionally rendered it by *πρόβατον* in the law of the Passover, we might argue that to the Greek translators the sheep was the normal, the goat but at best an abnormal, Paschal victim. As it is we must explain the facts otherwise: the sheep was the commoner and more conspicuous element in the flock, and therefore when a single head of the flock is in question, the Greek translators prefer to refer to it by a term strictly applicable (according to later Greek usage) to the commoner of the two species united in the flock: *πρόβατον* becomes a standing and conventional rendering of שה, and its use in any particular passage is no evidence that the translators were deliberately excluding the idea of goat. For example, when the Hebrew text

[1] Driver, *Exodus*, p. 89. [2] e. g. none by Dr., Baentsch.
[3] Ed. Simmonds, p. 90 B.]

says that as often as a lion carried off one of David's flock he went and rescued it and slew the lion, the Greek version in rendering שה by *πρόβατον* does not imply that the translators thought that David punished a lion who stole a sheep, but allowed him to finish his meal in peace if he merely stole a goat. Similarly we must not conclude from their rendering of Ex. $12^3$ that they held that sheep only were normal Paschal victims, and goats at best abnormal: and this the more so because even in v.$^5$ they still retain *πρόβατον* as a rendering of שה though strictly it is unsuitable: *πρόβατον . . . ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων λήμψεσθε*. Philo and Josephus fail on the point now under discussion to make any direct statement as to Jewish practice in the first century A. D.; but for an interesting and, perhaps, significant reason. Both refer to the Passover frequently, and frequently also to the Paschal victim, but for this latter they always use a neutral term;[1] neither ever speaks of a Paschal lamb or a Paschal goat but of the victim or sacrifice—*θῦμα*,[2] *θυσία*,[3] *τὰ ἱερεῖα*.[4] Since it would have been possible in some of these passages to substitute lamb or sheep, if lamb or sheep were really the exclusive or at least normal victim, we may infer that such was not the case, and that Paschal victim did not call up to the mind of either Philo or Josephus, or other contemporaries of theirs, a special type of animal: it was a victim they thought of, not of a particular kind of animal.

In modern Samaritan custom, it is true, sheep seem to have been the victims on all occasions at which recent observers have been present; but the number of animals slain for the whole community is small, not more than six or seven, and the modern Samaritan Passover is communal, not domestic. The custom cannot, therefore, be used as evidence for Jewish custom in Jerusalem 1900 years ago. Justin's use of *πρόβατον* in his reference to Paschal ritual, which may rest on his actual observance of Samaritan custom in his native place, is to be explained in the same way as its use in the LXX and partly as influenced by the LXX.

Giving due weight to the definite allusion in the Mishnah to

[1] Except in the citation from Ex. $12^3$ in *De Congressu*, 19 (Mangey, i. 534).
[2] Philo, *De Congressu*, 19 (Mangey, i. 534).
[3] Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* iii. 29 f. (Mangey, ii. 169, 170).
[4] Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* iii. 29 (Mangey, ii. 169).

Paschal goats, and to the neutral usage of Philo and Josephus, we must conclude that the alternatives provided for in the law were both actually in use down to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D.; and that the term פסח, Pascha, did not clearly and decisively suggest the thought of lamb or sheep as distinct from goat or kid. For this reason Dr. Moffatt's rendering of 1 Cor. $5^7$, 'Christ our Paschal lamb has been sacrificed', is inaccurate and may for certain purposes be misleading.

Even when the Paschal victim was chosen, as it most frequently was, from the sheep, was it a lamb or an older sheep? On this point the law is explicit, but in terms which have been differently interpreted. The term שה itself, used in Ex. $12^{3ff.}$ of the Paschal victim, is quite indefinite in respect of age: it means simply any single animal of the flock, whatever its age or to whichever of the two species, sheep or goats, it belonged. It is rendered 'lamb' in E.V., but as the E.V. itself shows that this lamb may be a goat, it will not be very surprising if the lamb, even when it was chosen from the sheep, had attained an age which would be considered excessive in an animal sold to be consumed as lamb.

It is of course perfectly possible that custom in the course of centuries varied in respect of the age of the victim as it varied in regard to the species from which it might be chosen. On one theory of the origin of the Passover and one theory of the interpretation of the phrase defining the age in Exodus, the custom did differ in early and in later periods. But this is a matter of inference. The one law explicitly defining the age is that of P in Ex. $12^5$, and this law dominated subsequent practice though indeed the possibility still remains that diversity of interpretation led even under the law to diversity of practice.

The law, then, requires that the Paschal victim shall be *ben-shanah*, 'son of a year'. But what does this mean? Does it mean that the animal must have attained the age of one year, or that it must not have exceeded that age? In the former case it would not be a lamb, even when it was chosen from the sheep, for, apart from translators of the Bible and others influenced by them, no one thinks of calling a sheep more than a year old a lamb. If, however, the phrase means that the animal has not exceeded a year, the Paschal sheep were mostly lambs.

Which of the two suggested meanings of the phrase is correct?

The E.V. renders 'of the first year', thus implying that the animal is, as we say, in its first year, but has not completed it. But in order to represent this view in its translation, the E.V. is compelled to abandon the mode of translation which it adopts in all other cases of the same idiom: wherever the Hebrew says of any one at his death, or accession, or what not, that he was the son of so many years, the E.V. invariably renders by 'he was so many years old', not 'he was in such and such a year of his life': and this even in the passage where this rendering presents a difficulty and is the strongest support for the theory that 'son of so-and-so many years' means 'in such a year'. 'Noah was a son of six hundred years when the flood came' (Gen. $7^{6}$): 'In the year of six hundred years of the life of Noah in the second month all the fountains of the great deep were broken open' ($7^{11}$): 'And it came to pass in the year 601 in the first month on the first day of the month the waters were dried up' ($8^{13}$). So, keeping close to the Hebrew idiom, these three statements read. E.V. translates 'Noah was six hundred years old when the flood was...', 'In the 600th year of Noah's life in the second month ... were all the fountains of the great deep broken up', 'In the 601st year, in the first month, in the first day of the month, the waters were dried up', and thus represents the flood as being over before it has begun, for according to English idiom the first day of a man's 601st year is the day on which he becomes 600 years old.

There is, however, other usage which suggests that 'son of' followed by a definition of time denotes the age already attained. For example, the age of festival service is defined in Num. $4^{3}$ as being 'from the son of thirty years upwards to the son of fifty', and similarly by the same idiom the minimum age is fixed as that of 'a son of 25 years' (Num. $8^{24}$) or 'a son of 20 years' (1 Chron. $23^{24}$). It is highly improbable that these statements mean not that the Levite reached the age of service at 20, 25, or 30 years according to the different laws, and the age of retirement at 50, but that the terms intended are the days on which he completed his 19th, 24th, 29th, and 49th years and *entered* on his 20th, 25th, 30th, and 50th years respectively. Again, when the census is taken of all Israel 'from the son of one month' and upwards, can this really mean anything but a census of those who have attained the age of a month or more?

If there is a certain conflict of evidence as to the precise meaning of the phrase that defines the age of the Paschal victim, it is well to take account of other considerations. The requirement that the victim should be *ben-shanah* is not peculiar to the Paschal victim: in particular all the chief communal and obligatory *burnt*-offerings (see Num. $6^{14}$, $7^{15}$, $28^{3}$, &c.) must be *ben shanah*. Which is more probable—that for these important offerings a certain degree of maturity, or a certain degree of immaturity,[1] should have been insisted on?[2] Again, the Greek version regularly renders the expression by *ἐνιαύσιος*.[3]

On the other hand, in Ex. $12^{5}$, in spite of the previous definition of the *πρόβατον* as *ἐνιαύσιον*, it is said that this *πρόβατον* is to be taken *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων*. And in Pesaḥim $8^{2}$ the victims are spoken of as טלה and גדי. So also Mechilta (p. 6) remarks שה בכלל גדי וטלה.[4] The Mishnah defines the upward limit of age at which an animal becomes invalid as a Paschal in Pes. ($9^{8}$), but unfortunately by the same ambiguous idiom that fixes the correct age: an animal that is בן שתי שנים is invalid. But Parah $1^{3, 4}$ is clear enough on the main point though it seems to use the phrase with בן loosely, if not inconsistently: (3) לכבשים בני שנה ואילים בני שתים וכולם מיום ליום בן שלשה חדש אינו כשר לא לאיל ולא לכבש . . . הקריבו מביא עליו נסכי איל ולא עלה לו מזבחו בן שלשה עשר חדש ויום אחד זה איל (4) חטאות הצבור . . . כשרים מיום שלשים והלאה ואף ביום שלשים ואם הקריבום ביום שמיני כשרים . . . נדרים ונדבות והבכור והמעשר והפסח כשרים מיום השמיני והלאה ואף ביום השמיני[5]: '(a sheep does not bear her young) till it is בת שתים, a goat when it is בת שנתה,

[1] Though on occasion a young lamb—sucking lamb—might be a burnt-offering, 1 Sam. $7^{9}$ (*Sir.* $46^{16}$).

[2] For בן־שנה of other than burnt-offerings see Lev. $23^{19}$; Num. $7^{17}$, &c., for peace-offerings; Num. $6^{12}$, for an אשם; and בת שנתה Num. $6^{14}$, $15^{27}$ for sin-offerings. See Hatch and Redpath, s.v. *ἐνιαύσιος*.

[3] Note also the use of the ageless term *πρόβατον* in Ex. $12^{5}$ (cp. Justin, *Tryphio*, $40^{3}$), Lev. $14^{10}$, $23^{12}$; though the commoner rendering with *ἐνιαύσιος* is *ἀμνός*, never *ἀρνός* (yet see Ex. $12^{5}$). Similarly where goats are concerned the rendering is *τράγος*, Num. $7^{88}$ or *αἴξ*, Num. $15^{27}$, not *ἔριφος*. But *μόσχοις ἐνιαυσίοις* Mi. $6^{6}$, Num. $8^{8}$.

[4] But similarly the שה that redeems a first-born ass is טלה in Bᵉch. $1^{3}$, though in $1^{4}$ the extensive connotation of שה is recognized.

[5] Cp. Bᵉch. $3^{1}$.

cows or asses בנות שלש', even this evidence balancing in a tantalizing manner.

But the conclusion I am inclined to draw is that the Paschal victim, according to the original intention of the law, even when not a goat was not a lamb, but an older sheep. The Rabbinical interpretation of the phrase בן שנה in the opposite sense is not clearly traceable back to the time of actual Jewish practice of sacrifice, though as it is found in the Mishnah it may have affected modern Samaritan practice. As to this the reports of observers are not quite clear and consistent: Stanley (op. cit.) speaks of the victims as 'sheep'; Thomson (loc. cit.) as 'lambs'; Montgomery (*Samaritans*, p. 38) asserts that the lambs used must have been born in the preceding Tishri, i. e. must be between six and seven months old.

And if so, we may go farther and suggest that faulty translation or interpretation has greatly exaggerated the part played in Jewish sacrificial ritual by the lamb in particular as distinct from the sheep in general; and that all or nearly all interpretation of sacrificial ideas that lays stress on the innocence and frailty of the victim as represented by the young lambs is wide of the mark.

In needing to be *ben shanah*, the Paschal victim has to satisfy a condition more frequently specified for a burnt-offering than for other kinds of offerings. One other condition required in the Paschal victim coincides with the conditions of a burnt-offering: like *all* burnt-offerings (Lev. $1^{3}$, &c.: $22^{18\,f.}$), it must be a male; whereas peace-offerings and also sin-offerings (Lev. 4 f.) could be either male or female (Lev. $3^{1}$). And yet in being eaten as a sacrificial meal the Paschal victim differed entirely from the burnt-offering and resembled the peace-offering. It thus occupies a place of its own among the sacrificial victims of the Jewish ritual; and in this it resembles the entire ritual, which has certain marked peculiarities corresponding to peculiarities of original purpose or subsequently developed ideas.

# XXIII

## THE BLOOD RITUAL OF THE PASSOVER

In earlier lectures I examined the view that the idea of gift was present in the minds of Jews when they thought of or engaged in sacrificial ritual. Briefly stated, the conclusion was that that idea was prominent, perhaps increasingly prominent; and that it was both reflected in and a moulder of the religious terminology of the last years of the Temple, when the Christian religion was differentiating itself from Judaism. At the same time it was never an exclusive idea. Two facts indicate that sacrifice was not merely a gift to God; and since these facts are constant, though they vary at different times in range and intensity, this is true of Jewish sacrifice at all periods of which we have any direct knowledge. Those two facts are: (1) the sacrificial meal; and (2) *certain* features of the blood ritual of sacrifice: certain other features are perhaps compatible with the gift idea. Both these facts are prominent in connexion with Passover; the blood ritual may at one period have been its most prominent and essential feature, and certainly at a later period the sacrificial meal attained to this position; alike in the Jewish sources of the first and second centuries A.D. and in the N.T. 'to eat the Passover' is a form which covers, by reference to its most important part, the whole ritual of the Passover.

Whether Passover was a sacrifice is an antiquated question which belongs to dead controversies as between Protestants and Roman Catholics; as in the celebrated controversies on the antiquity and inspiration of the vowel points of the Hebrew text, so here certain Protestant divines committed themselves to an untenable position in arguing that Passover was not a sacrifice; a victim which had to be slain at the Temple, whose blood had to be tossed down at the base of the altar, whose fat and other specified parts had to be burnt on the altar, was certainly

a sacrificial victim. Yet such a victim the Passover certainly was in the later days of the Jewish Temple,[1] and was intended to be by the author of Deuteronomy. Whether there ever existed in practice or theory a ritual of the Paschal victim that was not sacrificial, and whether certain Paschal rites are derived from practices which, on certain definitions of sacrifice, were not sacrificial, are other questions which need not be formally answered at present, but must in some measure receive consideration in the course of the following discussion.

Passover, then, was a sacrifice, and in inquiring into the blood ritual of Passover we are also inquiring into certain questions connected with the blood ritual of Jewish sacrifice in general. In all animal sacrifice blood ritual plays some part; at one stage of the history of the Paschal sacrifice the blood ritual played a conspicuous part. And when this becomes less conspicuous the Paschal meal rises into the most significant element, or gathers round it the chief significance of the rite.[2] These facts, or in any case the last, for the Paschal meal is certainly not a gift to God, point to the subordination of the gift idea in Passover. And correspondingly we find that the performance of the Paschal ritual is but rarely referred to as a presentation or offering to Yahweh, or the Paschal victim itself described as a present to Yahweh. The general phrase commonly used is 'to perform the Passover', עשה את הפסח;[3] and the particular elements in the

[1] Pes. $5^{5f.}$; cp. 2 Chron. $30^{16}$, $35^{11}$.

[2] So most clearly Pes. $7^{4}$: שלא בא מתחלתו אלא לאכילה with the consequences in $7^{4,5}$.

[3] Num. $9^{1-13}$, Ex. $12^{47-48}$, Dt. $16^{1}$ (+לי״), Jos. $5^{10}$, 2 Ki. $23^{21}$ (+לי״), (so Niph. v. 22, and with לי״ v. 23), 2 Chron. $30^{1,2,5}$ (+לי״), $35^{1}$ (+לי״) $17^{f.}$ (and so Niph. vv. 18, 19, Ezr. $6^{19}$: ? Jub. $49^{1}$). Cp. τελοῦμεν, Jos. *Ant.* iii. $10^{5}$. Cp. 2 Chron. $8^{13}$, where the offering (העלה) of the burnt-offering during the whole week of unleavened bread is referred to. Cp. 2 Chron. $30^{16}$ (ויביאו עלות), $35^{12}$: להקריב לי״ of the עולה. Cp. also Ex. $12^{24}$, ושמרתם את העבדה הואת שמר את הדבר הזה, ib. v. 25 (cp. v. 26); Ezek. $45^{21f.}$ יהיה לכם הפסח . . . ועשה הנשיא ביום ההוא . . . פר חטאת, Lev. $23^{5}$ בחדש הראשון . . . פסח לי״: so Num. $28^{16}$. Especially 2 Chron. $35^{16}$ ותכון כל עבדת יהוה ביום ההוא לעשות הפסח והעלות עלות על מזבח יהוה. With עבדה cp. the prominence in Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* iii. 29 f. (Mangey, ii. 196 f.) of ἱερουργία: so in summary: τῷ δὴ μηνὶ τούτῳ . . . ἄγεται τὰ διαβατήρια . . . τὸ Χαλδαϊστὶ λεγόμενον Πάσχα, ἐν ᾗ οἱ μὲν ἰδιῶται προσάγουσι τῷ βωμῷ τὰ ἱερεῖα,

performance commonly mentioned—and often in order by reference to an important part to imply the performance of the whole—are the (sacrificial) slaying (זבח),[1] whence it could be, therefore, and was called a זבח,[2] or slaughter (שחט)[3] of the victim; or the eating[4] of it. But the Passover as a sacrifice belonged to the class of offerings made to Yahweh; it was possible, therefore, to speak of presenting the Passover to Yahweh, and to call the Passover itself a Ḳorban or present; and this was occasionally done. So, though quite exceptionally, in one passage in the O.T. the Passover is called Ḳorban; this is the passage that contains the law of the second Passover, that Passover which was kept on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the second month by those who were prevented from keeping Passover on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the first month. 'Why,' ask the men who in this halachic Midrash are referred to as having been disabled at the first anniversary of the institution of Passover on the night of the Exodus, 'Why are we withdrawn from presenting Yahweh's present (לבלתי הקריב קרבן ליי)';[5] and the Midrash closes with the warning: 'That man who is clean and not on a journey, and yet fails to perform the Passover—that soul shall be cut off from its kinsmen; because he presented not Yahweh's present, that man shall bear his sin.'[6]

This passage in Numbers reappears with some expansion in Jubilees, where 49[9] reads thus in Charles's translation: 'And the man who is free from uncleanness and who does not come to observe it (viz. Passover) on occasion of its day, so as to bring an acceptable offering before the Lord, and to eat and drink before the Lord on the day of its festival, that man who is clean and close at hand shall be cut off: because he offered not the oblation

θύουσι δ' οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ νόμου προστάξει σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος ἱερᾶται, τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστου τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θυσίας ἀναγόντός τε καὶ χειρουργοῦντος. Cp. *De Septen.* ii. 18 (Mangey, ii. 292).

[1] Dt. 16[2] (זבחת פסח ליי) (1), 5, 6. [2] זבח פסח הוא ליי (Ex. 12[27]).

[3] Ex. 12[6, 21], 2 Chron. 30[15, 17] (שחיטת הפסחים), 35[1, 6, 11], Ezr. 6[20], Jubilees 49; cp. θύειν, Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10[5], ix. 13[3].

[4] Dt. 16[7], Ex. 12[7, (8), 11, 43–49], 2 Chron. 30[18], Ezr. 6[21] (LXX): Jubilees 49. Cp. also וישלו הפסח, 2 Chron. 35[13].

[5] LXX προσενέγκαι τὸ δῶρον Κυρίῳ.

[6] Num. 9[13]. 'Passover offerings' in 2 Chron. 35[7–9] (R.V.) is simply פסחים in M.T.

of the Lord in its appointed season, he shall take the guilt upon himself.' There is one other phrase in Jubilees, which, unless it rests on faulty translation, and this does not seem improbable, speaks of Passover as including within it a gift or offering to Yahweh: 'they shall slay the Passover . . . and they shall offer its blood on the threshold' (so Charles, but rather 'at the base') 'of the altar' (49[19 f.]).[1] For the rest, Jubilees speaks of Passover mostly as a performance, an observance, a slaughtering, or an eating; so especially in the opening summary: 'Remember the commandment which the Lord commanded thee concerning the Passover that thou shouldest celebrate it in its season on the fourteenth of the first month, that thou shouldest kill it before it is evening, and that they should eat it by night: for on this night . . . ye were eating the Passover in Egypt.'

Turning now directly to the blood ritual of the Passover, we first remark that we ought strictly to speak of the blood rituals of the Passover; for there are two entirely distinct rituals belonging to different ages, and probably reflecting different ideas. The earlier existence of a blood ritual totally different from that practised later is too plainly indicated in the text of Scripture to have escaped the notice of the Rabbis. The blood ritual actually practised later is not specifically prescribed for the Paschal victim in Scripture, though in the light of details in later sources, 2 Chron. 30[16], 35[11] imply that it was in force thus early, say *c.* 300 B. C.; it was in the main the application to the Paschal victim, as a species of sacrifice, of a ritual applicable to a wider class of sacrifice. The blood ritual actually prescribed in Scripture is one which, according to the Rabbis, and, until a critical treatment of Scripture arose, of Christian scholars as well, was only carried out on a single occasion, viz. on the night of the Exodus (Ex. 12[24]), though this view really conflicts with the requirement that 'this thing', by which in its present position

[1] So Charles; but the Latin is 'Et offerent sanguinem eius super basem altaris'. The 'basem' doubtless corresponds to היסוד, Pes. 5[6]; cp. Vg. *basis* = Heb. יסוד in Ex. 29[12], Lev. 4[7], &c. If the text of the version faithfully represents the Hebrew, the original probably ran: והקריבו את דמו על יסוד המזבח, cp. e. g. Lev. 1[5]; but 'offerent' probably = *προσοίσουσι*; this is possibly an error for *προσχέουσι*, which would equal וזרקו (not והקריבו).

the blood sprinkling (vv. 21 f.) must be referred to, is to be oberved as 'an ordinance for ever'. Cp. also vv. 26 ff.

'What is the difference', so the question is raised in the Mishnah,[1] 'between the Passover of Egypt and the Passover as a permanent institution?' And the answer given, so far as it concerns us here, is 'The Egyptian Passover was selected on the nineteenth day of the month, and it was required that its blood should be sprinkled on the lintel and on the two doorposts'.

According to the story of the Exodus, the lintel and the two doorposts[2] of each house in which Israelites were dwelling were to be daubed with blood, in order that Yahweh might by this sign distinguish the houses of his own people from those of the Egyptians, and in this way to be secured against killing the firstborn of a Hebrew family by mistake. That this is naive mythology, and not a history, scarcely requires elaborate proof. The ritual may, indeed, have been performed on the night of the Exodus, but not then for the first and only time, nor for the precise reason assigned to it in the story. The real historical value of the story lies in its witness to the existence of a long-continued custom or ritual of indefinite antiquity, *but still practised* when the story first took shape and form; and the shape and form of the story may be a great deal more ancient than the earliest literary source in which it has come down to us. Into the exact relation of Ex. $12^{21\,ff.}$, one of the passages which describe the blood ritual, to J we need not therefore enter; alike whether these verses belong to that work commonly known as J and referred to the ninth century B.C. or to some later, Deuteronomic, redaction of J,[3] the story and the custom are much more ancient. The blood ritual is also described by P (Ex. $12^{7,\,13}$). As the origin of the ritual cannot be precisely dated, but is of indefinite antiquity, so also the abandonment of the ritual cannot be referred to any definite point of time: on this point, what we can say, is firstly, that to the doctors of the Mishnah in the second century A.D. it was a custom so remote that they could believe

[1] Pes. $9^{8}$: מה בין פסח מצרים לפסח דורות.

[2] But not also the 'threshold', which some Rabbis (see M$^{e}$chilta) and others (Eerdmans, op. cit., *Exodus*, pp. 115–119) have inferred from the phrase הדם אשר בסף, which really means 'the blood which is the basin'.

[3] Baentsch, ad. loc. Beer, *P$^{e}$sachim*, p. 26, n. 4.

that it never had been observed but on the one occasion in Egypt; and, secondly, that the later custom, already established *c.* 300 B. C., of pouring out the blood at the base of the altar was probably from the first an alternative and not an additional mode of disposing of it; thirdly, that here, as elsewhere, the centralization of worship required by Deuteronomy, and carried out by Josiah, had a revolutionary *tendency.* Passover, according to Deuteronomy, was a *sacrificial* victim, and must therefore be slain and eaten in Jerusalem, and so, for all except the inhabitants of the city, *away from home.* Obviously the blood of an animal slain in Jerusalem at sundown on one day and eaten in Jerusalem the same night could not be applied to the houses of those who were not free till next morning to leave the city and return to their homes in the country (Dt. $16^{7}$). At the same time Deuteronomy does not definitely forbid the practice of the ancient custom, and perhaps it was only gradually that under the influence of the new law it fell into complete disuse. Down to something like the seventh or eighth century the custom would appear to have continued, for Ex. $12^{24,\ 25\ ff.}$ speaks of this ritual (העבודה הזאת) as of perpetual validity and at present practised. In P, as contained in Ex. 12, the distinction emphasized by the Rabbis between the Passover of (future) generations is, if not actually already present, at least not unnaturally suggested: Ex. $12^{1-13}$ contains the instructions for the observance of Passover in Egypt (vv. 12, 13), including the blood ritual (vv. 7, 13); $12^{43-49}$ contains the permanent 'ordinance of Passover' regulating the conditions under which sojourners among the people may eat the Passover. In this section the ritual of eating the Passover is given, but no blood ritual.

It is commonly held that this is all $P^{g}$, yet $12^{1\,b}$ looks like the beginning of a law that is to be of permanent applicability; and but for vv. 12, 13, and perhaps 11, no one would imagine that the law was limited to the single occasion. Is Ex. $12^{1-10\ (11)}$ $P^{x}$, a priestly law of uncertain date, earlier than $P^{g}$ (?), incorporated in P, expanded by $P^{s}$ later by the addition of vv. (11), 12, 13?[1] This would be intelligible if the blood ritual of Ex. $12^{22}$ (J) prevailed down to the time of Deuteronomy, and even then only became gradually obsolete.

[1] Cp. Eerdmans, who assigns $12^{1,\ 3-13}$ not to P but to a pre-exilic source.

What now precisely was this blood ritual? What was its purpose? How was it thought that that purpose was achieved? The consideration of these questions, and the answers to them, so far as answers may be obtained, throw light on Hebrew sacrificial theory and certain developments of Hebrew religious thought.

The ritual is simple, and its chief features are described with sufficient clearness. The blood of the victim, selected from the small cattle, sheep or goats (Ex. $12^{21}$ צאן; $12^{5}$ שה . . מן הכבשים ומן העזים) is applied (ונתנו על $12^{7}$; והגעתם על $12^{22}$) to the lintel and two doorposts of Israelite houses. According to one account ($12^{22}$) the blood previously collected in a basin (סף) is applied by means of a bundle or wisp of אזוב, i.e. marjoram or some such plant (אגדת אזוב). The victims, whose blood is thus used, are eaten within the houses ($12^{7, 13}$) to which the blood is applied according to the account of P, which, however, carefully abstained from using the term 'sacrifice' of the victims slain in Egypt; on the other hand, in the other account, nothing is *directly* said of the victim being eaten, though this is perhaps suggested by the term זבח פסח לי" (Ex. $12^{27}$). One detail is nowhere directly stated, but is most obviously implied, and special attention may be drawn to it, inasmuch as it invalidates certain explanations of the meaning put upon the ritual. The blood is applied to the lintel and the doorposts on the *outside*[1] of the house. This, I say, is obvious; for the blood is a sign to be seen by Yahweh as he passes by *outside* the house ($12^{13, 23}$), within which the inhabitants keep fast the whole night through ($12^{22}$).

To this Hebrew ritual modern investigation has found many parallels, some superficial and inexact, others much more essential and complete. But before we pass farther afield we may note a ritual that has at least a superficial resemblance to that of Passover in so far as it refers to the blood-smearing of doorposts, and, we may add, in that it takes place in the first month of the year, but which is perhaps less essentially similar than some have thought.[2] Ezekiel, with a view not improbably of perpetuating some ritual that had been observed in the pre-exilic Temple,

[1] The attempt in M$^{e}$chilta to imply that it was *inside* because it is called 'a sign to you', v. 3, is strangely forced.

[2] Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 226.

lays down this law for the temple of the future: 'In the first month, on the first day of the month, ye shall take a bullock without blemish, and unsin (חטא) the sanctuary: and the priest shall take some of the blood of the expiatory animal (חטאת) and shall apply it to the doorposts of the house, and to the four corners of the ledge of the altar, and to the doorposts of the gate of the inner court.' The purpose of this application of blood is clear: it is to draw out of the sanctuary the sin which has soaked into it during the past year, or rather the past six months, for the ceremony was repeated on the first day of the seventh month.[1] This 'unsinning' is effected by the application of the blood not merely to the outside of the entrance to the whole sacred enclosure, but to certain typical and prominent parts within it—the doorposts of the gateway leading from the outer into the inner court, the extremities of the altar which stood open to the sky, and the doorposts of the entrance to the Temple itself.

Closer analogies to the ancient Paschal blood ritual and other analogies which are closer to the Temple ritual described by Ezekiel have been detected in modern Syria or among the modern Arabs, not to speak of customs of people more remote. I select a few which have more or less resemblance, and which may, in one way or another, contribute to an understanding of the purpose with which the Paschal blood was originally and at

[1] The object of the ritual in Ezekiel is negative, not positive: it is to rid what is naturally holy from intrusive contamination, not to impart fresh positive holiness: the term חטא clearly implies this (Ezek. $45^{18}$), and in the light of this the force of כפר in v. 20 must be judged. LXX renders both by *ἐξιλάσασθαι* as also חטאת by *ἐξιλασμός*. The same negative aim of a similar ritual is most clearly indicated in Lev. $16^{19}$. W. R. Smith (*Rel. Sem.*[2], pp. 408 f.) therefore may or may not trace back the ritual to its actual creative idea, but he does not correctly indicate the precise idea which Ezek. and Lev. 16 attach to the ritual when he says 'It seems that the holiness of the altar is liable to be impaired, and requires to be annually refreshed by an application of holy blood—a conception . . . which is perfectly intelligible as an inheritance from primitive ideas about sacrifice, in which the altar-idol on its part, as well as the worshippers on theirs, is periodically reconsecrated by the sprinkling of holy (i.e. kindred) blood, in order that the life-bond between the God it represents and his kindred worshippers may be kept pure'. In Ezek. and Lev. the blood is not, as Smith suggests, a tonic but a disinfectant.

each stage of the history of the rite applied. 'I asked', says Doughty,[1] 'wherefore the corner of his new' (a point that differentiates this from the Paschal rite) 'building had been sprinkled with gore? They wondered to hear me question them thus . . . they thought I should have known that it was the blood of a goat which had been sacrificed to the jân for the safety of the workmen, "lest", as they said, "any one should be wounded".' Again, 'At evening he offered a young sheep for the health of his camels. . . . The ewe he had cast silent and struggling to the ground . . . then, kneeling upon it, in the name of God drew his sword across her throat. Some of the spouting blood he caught in a bowl, and with this he passed devoutly through the troop: and putting in his fingers he bedaubed with a blood-streak every one of his couching great cattle.'[2] Curtiss records an annual custom of the Ruala Arabs similar to this: 'In the month of Rejeb most members of the tribe offer a sheep or a goat and mark their camels with the blood in order to protect their herds against sickness and robbery.'[3] Of blood applied to buildings he cites two customs from Kerak: 'When the people are engaged in field labour they frequently take up temporary residence in a cave near their work. Before they begin their residence they present an offering to the spirit of the cave by cutting the throat of an animal at the entrance. They utter a certain formula of prayer and pour the blood on the ground. When a newly married pair take possession of their house, ancient custom requires that the throat of a sheep or goat should be cut on the roof of the house and the blood allowed to run down over the door-lintel.'[4] To these he adds instances in various parts of the country of the application of blood to the doorposts, lintels, or thresholds of makams or churches; in some cases oil mixed with the brilliant red-coloured henna is used as a substitute for blood.

An important class of cases in which blood is applied to *sanctuaries* is that in which the blood is *also* applied to persons. I am going to suggest that these are not exact parallels to the

[1] *Ar. Des.* ii. 100; cp. i. 136, 452.

[2] ib. i. 499; cp. Curtiss, op. cit., p. 183.

[3] Curtiss, op. cit., ch. xv.

[4] 183 f.; cp. pp. 184, 186, n. 1 (with reference to Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*).

Paschal rite, but it may be worth while to have them before us none the less, especially as they are cited, for example by Curtiss, along with customs already cited and not distinguished from them. In reply to a question as to the meaning of a bloody print of a child's hand on the lintel of a shrine (*mezar*) in a Mohammedan village, Curtiss was told by the sister of the Sheikh of the sanctuary this story: a woman whose child had had a sunstroke vowed an offering to the Weli in case of the child's recovery: the child recovered: the mother dipped his hand in the blood of the offering and caused him to leave a bloody print of his hand on the lintel. The Kurds between Ṣafita and Homs drive their sheep to the sanctuary: the first sheep that freely enters the sanctuary becomes thereby the property of the Weli; and as such is sacrificed. The doorposts of the sanctuary and the remaining sheep are smeared with the blood.

The following examples of modern Syrian explanations of some of these customs is of interest. . . . an offering is presented at the threshold and the lintel smeared with blood: according to some this is done 'for the sake of a blessing', according to others 'that none of the family may die'. The slain lamb is the redemption for the house—*fedu* (cp. פדה) *'an-el-bet*. Fedu is offered for houses, children, the newly married, the sick, and the dead. When a house is finished an offering is presented at the threshold. Every house must have its life, be it man, woman, child, or animal. God has appointed a definite fedu-offering for every house, and receiving that leaves the house alone.[1] An otherwise orthodox Mohammedan remarked: 'On the first night spent in a new house, the fedu is killed so as to cause its blood to spirt forth in the sight of God. It is a redemption price for the whole family: it also keeps away misfortune and Jinns.'[2] The bloody prints of hand smeared on the lintel of a sanctuary are said to be a sign that a promised offering has been punctually discharged.

In these and other such customs Curtiss has claimed that much of primitive Semitic ritual survives in the life of to-day; and in this he is right, though in some of those already cited and in others, it is scarcely less clear that both the exact ritual and the

[1] Curtiss, op. cit., p. 196. [2] p. 197.

exact explanation owe something also to Christianity or Islam. The native explanations of the customs differ; and probably as a matter of fact not all these customs, closely related with one another and with the Hebrew Paschal ritual as they appear at first sight to be, are to be traced to a single idea.

Thus blood rituals at the entrance to a dwelling appear to fall into two classes, so far as their purpose is concerned; they are directed either to what is within or to what is without. The outpouring of blood at the *open* entrance to a cave before it is occupied as a dwelling, or before a *new* house, as also on the foundations of a new house, are most readily and naturally explained as offerings made in the first instance to the spirits of the spot, who are thought of as within the cave or on the site of the new house, with a view of propitiating them. This original idea may be modified or obscured through the influence of higher beliefs; but it is probably the *origin* of rites that still survive among both the Christian and Mohammedan population in Syria. Closely related to these rites are those in which the blood is applied both to the person and to the entrance to the sanctuary: here there can be little doubt but that the belief in communion through blood has been active: by the rite the person smeared with blood is brought into contact with the spirit, god, or power to whom the sanctuary belongs.

But there is another blood ritual of the door: this consists in the application of the blood *outside* the *closed* door. This is not a ritual that is at all obviously directed towards propitiating a power within the house with whom those who are to live in the house must make their peace; on the other hand, it obviously suggests a relation to some power *without* the house, which it is desired to prevent from gaining entrance. To this class of door rituals the Passover blood ritual as described in Ex. 12 clearly belongs: the blood is applied to the outside of the lintel and doorposts and then the door is shut fast; moreover, in the story told to explain the rite the purpose of the ritual is quite distinctly said to be the exclusion of Yahweh, or his representative or manifestation, 'The Destroyer' (Ex. $12^{23}$). The blood ritual of the early Passover is thus an instance of what we may term the 're-inforced closed door': the closed door by itself is insufficient to keep out the unwelcome visitant; it is strengthened

by the application of blood, salt, plants of special virtue, or by the delineations of the outspread hand, all of which in folk custom are credited with virtue in repelling unwelcome spirits. 'The hand', says Mr. Spoer of modern Syria, 'is sometimes found on Moslem houses, the sequel of some occasion of sacrifice . . . when those concerned will dip their hands in the blood of the victim, goat and sheep and fowl, and will mark some flat surface near the entrance to the house to distract the attention of the Jinn.'[1] And again, 'Salt is sacred, and a little spread on the threshold of a house or room has a good effect and serves to keep powers of evil at a distance' (ib. p. 70).

Whether the Paschal blood ritual is thus correctly and completely explained as to its origin, this explanation at least seems to be the only one that gives an adequate and satisfactory reason for the ritual as practised when the stories in Exodus were framed to explain it away. The Hebrews applied the blood to keep something outside their houses on Passover night; the stories and the laws, representing a revulsion from the purpose of the rite as popularly understood, explain it as a memorial of the way in which something was kept out on a particular occasion; according to these laws there is no further call or right to smear doorposts in order to keep something out of the house now.

Using the technical term we must say that the Passover blood ritual has an *apotropaic* purpose. Since it aimed at keeping some power at a distance, it certainly did not directly aim at communion; whether at any time it definitely aimed at excluding one power by entering into communion with another, whether in virtue of an offering made to that other power or because the blood had in it the superior potency of that other power, may be a subject for consideration; but there is in our accounts not the slightest hint of this, and in particular no hint that the blood was a means to communion, but merely that this at least in particular had the opposite effect of disunion and isolation. Nor again is there any good ground for believing that the Paschal blood was, while the rite was practised, regarded as expiatory: that, like the blood applied to the Temple in Ezekiel's ritual, it was thought to suck out the sin of the house. At a *later* date we find this idea

[1] *Folk Lore*, xviii. 66 f.

sometimes suggested as, for example, presumably by Josephus, who says in his account of the Passover in Egypt that 'they offered the sacrifice and purified (ἥγνιζον) their houses with the blood, using bunches of hyssop for that purpose'.

The apotropaic function of the Paschal blood ritual is clear: but what was the blood intended to repel? The story in Exodus, if not accepted as strictly and entirely historical, obviously represents a modification and correction of ancient popular ideas. And here there are two possibilities: either the story is intended to correct a popular conception of Yahweh, or to counteract a popular recognition of other divine powers than Yahweh.

The former view is taken e.g. by Ed. Meyer: according to him Yahweh in the old popular belief was a night demon who feared the daylight, and who on Passover night in particular roams abroad to suck up sacrificial blood: then no man durst be abroad, but was careful to protect his house against the blood-thirsty deity by smearing the lintel and doorposts of his house with blood.[1] And Frazer[2] and Gressmann[3] offer a similar explanation, though the last named adds that the ideas out of which the legend told in Exodus grew are rooted in remote antiquity and have essentially nothing to do with the religion of Yahweh. This view that the earlier Paschal custom rested on a savage conception of *Yahweh* hangs together with the theory that the Paschal victims were the *firstlings* of sheep or goats substituted for a yet earlier annual sacrifice to Yahweh of all the new firstborn children of the year. This theory is on many grounds disputable, and assumes a conception of Yahweh decidedly more savage than any other evidence even remotely suggests.

The other view is that the story of the Passover reflects a movement which tends to substitute Yahweh for other supernatural beings: what the ancient Hebrews endeavoured to repel from their houses were spirits, demons of plague or sickness or the like,[4] much as the modern Bedawy or Syrian peasant. The

[1] *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 38.

[2] *Golden Bough*[2], iv. (*The Dying God*) pp. 174–178.

[3] *Moses und seine Zeit*, 104.

[4] Eerdmans: 'The festival obviously rests on the idea that the first full moon after the spring equinox is very dangerous' (op. cit., *Exodus*, p. 118).

lawgiver, as in other instances,[1] allows the old *custom* deeply rooted in religious belief which recognized other unseen powers than Yahweh to continue, but endeavours to supply it with a reason that enforces the supremacy of Yahweh; it tolerates the custom but seeks to undermine the devotion of the people to or their concern with these other objects of religious awe.

In this particular instance the law gradually effected the cessation of the custom. But the old apotropaic motive reappeared in another form: it is not any longer, however, the blood that keeps something out of the house, but the whole punctual discharge of the Paschal ritual: again, it is not jinns or spirits or beings that could in any way dispute the supremacy with Yahweh that are repelled, but evils controlled by Yahweh and *by him* kept away from the houses of those who carry out his ritual law. This interesting mingling of ancient motive and more recent theology appears in Jubilees: 'And do thou command the children of Israel to observe the Passover throughout their days, every year, once a year, on the day of its fixed time, and it shall come for a memorial before the Lord, and no plague shall come upon them to slay or to smite in that year in which they celebrate the Passover in its season in every respect according to his command' (49[16]).

Of the later blood ritual it is unnecessary to say much. It is totally different from and unrelated to the early ritual. The centralization of worship led to the cessation of the application of blood to dwelling-houses, and virtually necessitated disposal in some manner within the sanctuary. The laws of the O.T. do not define this manner. But the references in Chronicles indicate that as early as the third century B.C. the essential element in the ritual described in the Mishnah was already in force: the blood was thrown out in mass at the base of the altar:[2] in other words, it was disposed of with the simplest possible altar ritual. As described in the Mishnah[3] the ritual of the transfer of the blood from the place of slaughter to the altar has developed to a certain extent: 'The priests stood in two rows, having in their hands silver and golden basins, one row had basins all of gold, the other all of silver, and the two sorts were not mixed. These

[1] Cp. *Numbers*, p. 47 f.

[2] More explicit, Jubilees 49[20].

[3] Pes. 5[5b].

basins had no flat bottoms, to prevent them from being set down, so allowing the blood to congeal. An Israelite performed the act of slaughter, a priest received (the blood in a basin) and passed on to his fellow and his fellow to the rest, passing on the full basins and passing back the empty ones: the priest nearest the altar tossed out the blood with a single toss at the base of the altar.'

It so happens that in the O.T. the only offerings of which it is prescribed that the blood shall be poured down at the base of the altar are sin-offerings (Lev. $4^{7, 18, 25, 30, 34}$, $5^{9}$, $8^{15}$), and the bullock offered at the investiture of the priests (Ex. $29^{12}$, Lev. $9^{9}$). But it would be a mistake to infer from this that the Paschal victim was a sin-offering, even if the treatment of the flesh did not point strongly away from this. For in the case of the offerings just referred to, it is only the *remainder* of the blood that is thus disposed of after some of it has been used for the much more significant purpose of smearing the horns of the altar.

It would no doubt be a mistake to assert that this method of disposing of the Paschal blood was adopted merely for convenience. Like the offering of the fat parts on the altar, it is due to the fact that the Paschal victim was regarded in some degree as a gift to God; this is, indeed, directly stated in Jubilees if the reading 'they shall present the blood' is correct. But in the relative simplicity of the rite, we may perhaps see another indication that the thought of gift in connexion with the Paschal victim was much less intense than in connexion with most other sacrifices.

# XXIV

## THE PASCHAL MEAL

THE Paschal meal is probably one of the original, certainly one of the earliest elements in the Paschal ritual. It survives to the present day among the Samaritans, and, with certain modifications due to the cessation of sacrifice, among the Jews, for with them in this case the ancient sacrificial rite is not perpetuated merely by the substitution of prayer for sacrifice.

In this long history the Paschal meal has undergone marked changes, some at least of which can be clearly and closely observed. The manner of taking the Paschal meal in the first century of our era is known in considerable detail: so also is the modern Jewish and Samaritan practice. For earlier periods the detail is scantier, though sufficient to render the fact of change certain.

Of the two narratives of the Passover as celebrated in Egypt on the night of the Exodus, which both agree in representing as the first celebration, the one (Ex. $12^{21-23\ (+24-28)}$) commonly ascribed to some stratum of J says nothing at all of the Paschal meal apart from what may be implied in the phrase זבח פסח הוא ליי in v. 27 of the memorial celebration in Canaan, if this proceeds from the same hand as vv. 21–23, but confines itself to the blood ritual; the other, Ex. $12^{1-13}$ (P), describes both meal and blood ritual and represents the meal as eaten at home, in the several houses on the outside of which the blood of the victim had been previously sprinkled. It would be precarious to argue that the meal was unknown to the narrator, who does not directly mention it in his narrative of Passover ritual on the night of the Exodus; for he does not refer in any way to what was done with the remainder, including the flesh of the victim whose blood was used to sprinkle the houses: yet something must have been done with it; and on the analogy of the destiny of animals used for some ritual

purpose it must either have been solemnly eaten, or solemnly disposed of in some other way, such as burning. Since there is no indication by way of revival of any other form of disposal of the Paschal victim, we may conclude with probability that the eating of the Paschal victim was as ancient a rite as the sprinkling of its blood, however much the more important of the two the latter rite may have been.[1]

That the Paschal victim was to be eaten was directly commanded in the law of Dt. $16^{1-8}$, and it is clearly implied that the Paschal meal was already an ancient rite: in other words, Dt. certainly does not institute a new rite, but modifies the existing and long practised rite of eating the Paschal victim.

Before we turn to examine more closely the various descriptions given of the Paschal meal, it may be convenient to consider the m nner in which, according to an hypothesis based on certain analogies and inferences from certain features in the later ritual, the Paschal victim was eaten in the earliest times.

In connexion with the Paschal meal the later law contains two remarkable prohibitions: the participants in the Paschal meal are forbidden to eat the victim raw,[2] or to break any of its bones.[3] A legal prohibition is commonly directed against what is, or has been, actual practice. It has therefore been inferred that at one time the Paschal victim was eaten raw, and that the bones, having been broken and pounded for the purpose, were eaten as well as the flesh.[4] Such a mode of consumption is not without analogy, and W. R. Smith gave prominence to the analogy furnished by Nilus's description of a Saracen sacrifice in the fifth century A.D. In spite of their familiarity I must quote his words here:[5] 'Of all Semitic sacrifices those of the Arabs have the rudest and most visibly primitive character; and among the Arabs, where there was no complicated fire-ceremony at the altar, the sacramental

[1] As presumably in the modern *Fedu*. Jaussen cites a modern use of the Fedu by the inhabitants of Ma'an to prevent the cholera, which was ravaging neighbouring districts, from attacking them – 'Each family chose a victim for this sacrifice, immolated it, prepared it on the spot and distributed it to the poor after having previously eaten some of it themselves. Each took the blood of the sacrifice to stain with it the front of his door'. *Coutumes des Arabes du Pays de Moab*, p. 362.

[2] Ex. $12^{9}$.

[3] Ex. $12^{46}$.

[4] W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*[2], p. 345, n. 1.

[5] op. cit., pp. 338 f.

meal stands out in full relief as the very essence of the ritual. Now in the oldest known form of Arabian sacrifice, as described by Nilus, the camel chosen as the victim is bound upon a rude altar of stones piled together, and when the leader of the band has thrice led the worshippers round the altar in a solemn procession accompanied with chants, he inflicts the first wound while the last words of the hymn are still upon the lips of the congregation, and in all haste drinks of the blood that gushes forth. Forthwith the whole company fall on the victim with their swords, hacking off pieces of the quivering flesh and devouring them raw with such wild haste that, in the short interval between the rise of the day star, which marked the hour for the service to begin, and the disappearance of its rays before the rising sun, the entire camel, body and bones, skin, blood, and entrails, is totally devoured. The plain meaning of this is that the victim was devoured before its life had left the still warm blood and flesh—raw flesh is called "living" flesh in Hebrew and Syriac—and that thus in the most literal way, all those who shared in the ceremony absorbed part of the victim's life into themselves. One sees how much more forcibly than any ordinary meal such a rite expresses the establishment or confirmation of a bond of common life between the worshippers, and also, since the blood is shed upon the altar itself, between the worshippers and their god'.

To this it may be worth while to add Beer's[1] more recent setting of such a theory, brought more directly than by Smith into relation with the Paschal meal treated as of pre-Mosaic and non-Yahwistic origin. 'The Paschal meal', he says, 'secures to the clansmen the protection of their god (*Herdengott*). It unites them closely (*verbrüdert*) with him. The original meaning of the meal is even more realistic. *The animal slain and eaten is itself the god offered and enjoyed.* The command not to devour the Passover raw is directed against a very ancient custom, occasionally revived in civilized life (*in der Kultur*), in obedience to which the Passover was (once) eaten raw. In the body and quivering flesh is hidden the elixir of life. The blood itself is the god, the possessor of the life-magic.'

On this theory of the Paschal meal the double Paschal ritual of sprinkling the blood and eating the victim secured its main

[1] *P*sachim*, p. 15.

end, the security of the household, by a double method: the blood sprinkled without kept evil powers at bay, and the meal eaten within renewed the divine life of the inhabitants.

But were these two ideas ever quite so closely associated as this implies? Even if it be granted that in origin, and at a sufficiently remote period, every sacrificial victim was deemed a god and every one who fed on it was supposed thereby to renew his own fading divinity, how much of this idea survived when the blood of the victim was collected in a basin and thence transferred to the front of the house to keep somebody or something out? If the blood was drawn off for this purpose, the elixir of life was so far drained away before the participants in the meal began to eat: and this hypothetical ancient meal was, on this theory, a much less effectual tonic than the camel that furnished forth the relatively modern meal of Nilus' Saracens. If they daubed the houses with the blood before eating, the divine life was all the time growing less in the gradually cooling flesh; and if they devoured the flesh first and then pounded up the bones to make them also eatable, the blood set aside for the house would be coagulating, and becoming inconvenient for applying to the outside of the house.

It looks then as if the union of the two characteristic Paschal rites took place *after* sacrificial meals had ceased to be *exclusively* made off raw and just killed animals; as an *occasional* custom, it is true, eating flesh of newly slain victims with the blood still in it and not drained off still existed in the time of Saul (1 Sam. $14^{32}$). But the prohibition in the Paschal law may be directed not against an earlier custom of eating the Paschal victim raw, but against ever allowing the Paschal victim to be eaten as other victims sometimes were. As an alternative we may suppose what is possible, though not very probable, that the external application of blood is as a Paschal rite secondary to the meal; that the meal was originally of raw flesh with the blood in it, but became modified to a meal of cooked flesh with the blood drained out of it when the external application of blood was added to the earlier and simpler Paschal ritual. In either case, if the idea of communion is most vividly expressed when the sacred victim is consumed raw, flesh and blood together, and grows dimmer when the victim is cooked before being eaten, we

must conclude that the apotropaic idea expressed by the blood externally applied and the idea of communion expressed by the sacred meal no longer both remained at their strongest when the two rites were discharged as in the Paschal ritual by means of the same victim : that it was the idea of communion that suffered ; how vivid that idea remained in the case of the Paschal meal is only part of the question how far the idea remained vivid in the whole class of Hebrew sacrifices in which the greater part of the victim was used for human consumption.

I pass to other and more certain features in the history of the Paschal meal. The Reformation of Josiah aimed at effecting, and ultimately effected, a change in regard to the place of sacrifice that affected *all* Jewish sacrifices. Prior to that time any sacrifice could be offered in an indefinite, and potentially in an unlimited, number of different places : after that time every sacrifice could be offered in one place and one place only, viz. Jerusalem. But the history of the ' where ' of the place of celebration is in the case of Passover more complex than this ; like other acts of worship it was affected by the Reformation, but it was affected more : on the other hand, it may be said in a certain sense to have resisted the effect of the Reformation more, and to have perpetuated one of its most distinctive features, which the Reformation threatened, not only down to the fall of the Temple and the cessation of sacrificial service, but even to the present day.

Three differences of custom in regard to the place in which the Paschal meal was eaten can be clearly discerned, and the chronological relations of the different practices scarcely less clearly. In the earliest times, wheresoever exactly the Paschal victim was slain, the Paschal *meal* was eaten at home, in the house of each Hebrew householder ; later, after the Reformation of Joshua, the Paschal meal was eaten, as the Paschal victim was slain, within the Temple area at Jerusalem ; later still, certainly by the first century A.D., the victim was still slain in the Temple enclosure, its blood and fat were conveyed to the altar, but the *meal* was eaten by small companies in the houses of Jerusalem. The last stage returns to the first in so far as the meal is eaten in separate houses, though except for the permanent inhabitants in Jerusalem it was not as formerly eaten at *home*, by each in his

own house. That further return to the earliest custom only became possible when a Paschal sacrifice could no longer be offered; the modified Paschal meal, graced by no Paschal victim, but perpetuating other practices that gradually gathered round the meal, which continued to be eaten year by year after the fall of the Temple and is still eaten, was once again and is still eaten at home. Thus in its earliest form the Paschal meal was pre-eminently a *domestic* rite, in respect both of those who formed the several Paschal companies, which were limited to the members of a single house, or by the law of Ex. $12^4$ (P) under certain conditions of two *neighbouring* households, and in respect of its being eaten in the actual home; as transformed by the Reformation it loses its domestic character and becomes assimilated to the meal that formed the chief feature in every class of 'slain' or 'peace'-offering (זבח); it was eaten at the sanctuary away from home, and not till the next morning when the meal was over were those who discharged the duty free to return home (Dt. $16^7$): this method of celebration survives to the present day among the Samaritans, who eat the meal not in their houses in Shechem, but an hour away on the mountain side of Gerizim on or near the site where their Temple once stood. The custom of eating not in houses but in the sanctuary appears to have prevailed among the Jews also down to the second century B.C., for it is clearly enforced in Jub. $49^{16\,ff.}$, but by the first century A.D., probably as a result of the vastly increased numbers coming to Jerusalem for Passover, the meal was taken in the houses of Jerusalem; this in itself entailed a most marked separation into distinct Paschal companies, and this distinction of company from company was insisted on, so much so that Pesachim ($7^{13}$) provides that where, owing to the pressure on space, two companies partook of the meal in the same room (בית), they must eat with their backs to one another and carefully abstain from looking away from their own or at the other company: if a single attendant serves both companies, he must be a member of and eat with one only; when he attends to the other company he must not speak to them, and he must while serving turn his face away from them. The only relaxation in these regulations is in the case of the bride, who if bashful and wishful to avoid too continuous an inspection of her face by her own company may

turn it away from them. But while an individual was forbidden to eat Passover by himself (Pes. $8^7$) and the distinction of companies is insisted on, these companies are no longer necessarily *families*: they are as Josephus calls them *φρατρίαι*, or as the Mishnah calls them חבורת—companies not necessarily held together by any ties of kindred, but of friendship, common aims, or the like (cp. חבר): [1] our Lord and the Twelve formed such a חבורה, and they satisfied the rule that obtained in this late period that the company must consist of not less than ten, though it might consist of more, and actually, according to Josephus, numbered twenty: [2] the upward limit seems to have been determined by the rule that there might only be one Paschal victim for each company and that each participant must eat a piece of flesh at least as large as an olive (Pes. $8^7$).[3]

Turning now from the company assembled to eat it to the constituents of the Paschal meal, we observe first that the certainly constant element here, down to the fall of Jerusalem among the Jews, down to the present day with the Samaritans, is the Paschal victim. If the hypothesis previously discussed that the Paschal victim in a remote pre-historic age was eaten raw, blood and all, immediately after death be correct, then in that period it probably formed the sole constituent of the meal. But in the earliest periods to which records carry us back the meal was already more complete. Whether originally so or not, from the date of the earliest laws regulating the Paschal meal (Dt. $16^{5}$, Ex. $12^{4}$ (P)), it fell within the period of seven days during the whole of which ordinary leavened bread was taboo: at the Paschal meal, therefore, leavened bread (חמץ) was expressly forbidden (Dt. $16^{3}$); but unleavened bread was not only permitted, but from the time when Dt. $16^{1-8}$ assumed its present form, of P, or the law incorporated in P, enjoined (Dt. $16^{3}$, Ex. $12^{4}$) as (Dt. $16^{3}$) a reminder of the affliction in Egypt, which according to tradition ended with the preparation of unleavened cakes which were taken by

[1] A company might not, however, consist exclusively of women, slaves, and children (Pes. $8^7$).

[2] *B. J.* vi. $9^3$.

[3] Yet while the Paschal company needed not to be a family party, a family group continued to be the normal party; the Haggadah presupposes such a company (Pes. $10^4$; cp. also Pes. $8^5$).

the people as they escaped from bondage; and both taboo and command were later enforced.[1] A third element in the Paschal meal prescribed in the O.T. is 'bitter herbs' (מררים) which, according to the Mishnah (Pes. $2^6$), might be lettuce or endive or one of three other kinds of salad; the original reason for the inclusion of these in the Paschal meal is obscure, but from the time of Gamaliel (Pes. $10^5$) they were regarded as a reminder that 'the Egyptians made bitter the lives of our fathers in Egypt'.

The Paschal victim, unleavened cakes, bitter herbs, these were certainly constituents of the Paschal meal as early as the fifth century B.C., and probably yet earlier. Other constituents are mentioned, and are indeed prominent in later authorities such as the Mishnah, and some of these, at least, appear to be modern introductions. It is curious that so deeply national an institution as the Passover should have been affected by Hellenistic influence. Yet though this influence may have been exaggerated by Beer, of its reality there seems no room for doubt, and it may have affected in some measure even the comestibles at the meal.

Of these later attested constituents of the meal the most important is *wine*. It has indeed been urged that wine was at all periods a natural part of any important Hebrew meal, and, therefore, presumably in ancient times of the Paschal meal also: and, were we reduced merely to an argument from silence, this might have weight: but we are not. If the Paschal meal, as well as the rite of applying the blood, is of nomad origin, it is practically certain that in the nomadic period the meal was eaten without wine (cp. the Rechabites), and probable that this custom perpetuated itself for long after the settlement in Canaan. But the strongest argument in favour of wine being a relatively recent introduction into the Paschal meal is the fact that it has never formed part of the Samaritan celebration. Even if it was used by the Hebrews at an earlier period, and for some reason which it would be hard to discover subsequently fell into disuse with the Samaritans, it would still remain improbable that it formed anything like so prominent a feature in the ancient Paschal meals as in those of the first century A.D. when the four

[1] *Pesachim, passim.*

obligatory cups of wine articulated the whole meal. The earliest reference to the use of wine is in Jubilees 49[6], where, indeed, it is referred back to the first Passover in Egypt.

The wine, according to the Mishnah (Pes. 10[2, 4]), was mixed, viz. with water; and in this, as in the introduction of wine into the meal, Beer (*Pes.*, p. 72) detects Graeco-Roman influence. Be this as it may, the importance of the wine in the later Paschal meal is in many ways indicated. Even the poorest must have his four obligatory cups of wine, even though he must get the money for this amount of wine from the poor box (10[1]); the amount of *wine* involved has been estimated at one-eighth litre or about a quarter pint.[1] Between the first and second and between the third and fourth of the obligatory cups, other wine might be drunk at discretion. A curious regulation has given rise to the suspicion that wine drinking was sometimes carried to excess; it is in any case of interest as indicating the prolonged nature of the Paschal meal in later times. 'If some of the company have fallen asleep, the rest may continue to eat of the Passover; if all have fallen asleep, no one afterwards may eat.' Rabbi Jose allowed the resumption of eating if the company had only dozed (נתנמנמו), and had not gone fast asleep.[2]

The Paschal meal was a sacred meal. It was this in the first instance because its original and, to the downfall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., its constant element was a sacrificial victim—an animal solemnly slain within the Temple precincts whose fat was offered on the altar, whose blood was poured away at the base of the altar. So little was the sacrificial nature of the victim called in question by the fact that it was no longer *eaten* as well as slain within the Temple precincts that Philo derives from the sacrificial nature of the victim one of what appear to him the most noteworthy features in the whole Paschal ritual: this ritual was peculiar not only by reason of the place where the victim was slain, but also by reason of those who slew it; the Paschal victim was slain not by the sacred class of Levites as had become the custom with other sacrifices, but by the owners and presenters of the Paschal victims; and by this act the layman became for the time being a priest. 'On this day', says Philo, 'the whole

[1] Beer, *Pesachim*, 190. [2] Pes., 10[8]; Beer, *Pesachim*, 199.

nation sacrifices (*θύουσι πανδημεί*), without waiting for their priests, the law having granted to the whole nation for one day in each year a priesthood (*ἱεροσύνην*) to attend to the sacrifices (*εἰς αὐτουρίαν θυσιῶν*).'[1]

There is another circumstance of the meal which is most probably explained by the sacrificial element in it: and for the first reference to this we are indebted to Philo, though it may be of indefinitely greater antiquity than his days. The Paschal meal at night was preceded by a fast (*νηστεία*) during the day, an abstinence from food and drink.[2] The hours of fasting in the Mishnah (Pes. 10[1]) are limited to the afternoon (מבעוד למנחה), i. e. from 12.30 or 1.30—a shorter period than we might have thought probable from Philo's mode of reference to it. Unfortunately Philo offers no explanation of the significance or purpose of this preparatory fast, though once again his mode of reference scarcely suggests that he held the theory already put forward by the Rabbis of the Gemara (Pes. 99 a, l. 15 ff.) that it was designed to increase the appetite for the evening feast. Certainly if the fast be really ancient this Rabbinic theory fails to hit the mark, and we should rather seek for an explanation of its origin in the widespread custom of receiving sacred food into a stomach rendered empty by previous fasting or even by the use of emetics. Yet whether this original purpose of the fast was in any way realized by Philo or his contemporaries is very doubtful: by most of them it was probably practised merely as a custom received from the past; its original meaning was lost, and the field of explanation lay vacant for the Rabbis of the Gemara to take possession of it.

That so long as sacrifice lasted the Paschal meal was a *sacrificial* meal is certain: but there seems strong reason for concluding that the later developments of the Paschal meal tended greatly to *subordinate* the sacrificial element in it. The sacred character of the meal had been originally secured by its sacrificial character, but it was no longer dependent on or even mainly due to this. The sacrificial element in it was rather ready to perish: and accordingly, after the cessation of sacrifice in A. D. 70, the Paschal meal lived on as a meal no less sacred than before: the

[1] *De Decal.* 30 (Mangey, ii. 206). Cp. *De Vita Mosis*. iii. 29 (Mangey, ii. 169). [2] Philo, ib. Cp. *De Septen.* 18 (Mangey, ii. 292).

flesh of the Paschal victim could no longer be eaten at it, and other food was substituted for it: but that was all. We do not expect emotion in the Mishnah, and we must not overpress, but we need not overlook the bald reference which we find there to the change. 'They present before him (i. e. the Master of the feast) unleavened cakes and lettuce and sauce and two cooked dishes. . . . While the Temple stood they presented before him the Paschal victim itself' (גופו שלפסח, Pes. 10[3]).

From being a hasty meal in which the eating of the sacrificial goat or sheep was the first duty and the main feature, Passover had become a prolonged celebration, the meal beginning soon after sundown and not necessarily concluding before midnight. These hours were not merely the hours of a meal or symposium; they were hours of worship: and the worship was no longer merely or even prominently sacrificial. In the elaborate articulation of the meal, the eating of the sacrificial victim was now but a single phase: and with the cessation of sacrifice it dropped out without serious dislocation of the greater part which still survived. Again, the meal had become charged with sacred associations which had given rise to the really prominent and dominant features of the liturgy that accompanied the meal; the sacrificial element dropped out with the cessation of sacrifice, but these other elements of worship could and did survive.

In the articulation of the feast by means of cups of wine, in the mingling of the wine with water, in the sauce, in the reclining posture in which the meal was eaten, and in other features of it, Graeco-Roman influence has been sought and not wholly amiss. But in those features of the evening to which we now turn, that influence is certainly betrayed by the tell-tale evidence of language. Yet here, as so constantly in the history of Hebrew religion, what is foreign is borrowed, but is turned to peculiarly Jewish ends. After the fourth cup the Mishnah lays down: 'They do not yet dismiss the company: after the Passover epikomion.'[1] Epikomion, here, certainly means song, the singing of songs of a festal or triumphal nature, though not necessarily or probably *processional* singing or the singing accompanying

[1] אין מפטירין אחר הפסח אפיקומין, Pes. 10[8]. Against the incorrect and antiquated interpretation of אפיקומין as 'dessert', see Merx, *Die Vier Kanon. Evang.* ii. 424 f.; Beer, *Pes.*, pp. 62, 74, n. 4, 199.

a revel (*κῶμος*: cp. Rom. $13^{13}$), as Merx and Beer suggest; for this would seem to conflict with the law אין מפטירין; for how could two companies taking Passover in the same room make procession without seeing one another, though this, as we have seen, was another regulation of Passover?

But this singing *after* the Passover was consumed and before the companies parted was not the only singing of the evening; and for other singing we have earlier evidence that incontestably carries back the custom of song during the evening into the first half of the first century B.C. and increases the probability,[1] created by the use of the Greek term, that the epikomion also originated before the fall of the Temple and was not introduced between that date and the compilation of the Mishnah. 'They come together,' says Philo, of the Paschal meal, 'not as to other symposia in order to please their belly by means of wine and viands, but to fulfil an ancestral custom with prayers and hymns.'[2] The prayers and hymns associated with the Passover in Philo's time are to him its *essential* features: not to eat or drink, though as a matter of fact they did both, but to pray and to sing, the company assembled.[3]

Not only hymns but the story of the past and the exposition of Scripture marked the evening. This feature of Passover night; this circumstance of the Passover meal, grew more elaborate and more fixed in form between A.D. 70 and the compilation of the Mishnah, *c.* A.D. 200. It is rooted in the Biblical commands, 'when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is Passover to Yahweh, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, but rescued our houses (Ex. $12^{26\,f.}$): and 'thou shalt tell thy son in that day (when unleavened bread is eaten), It is because of that which Yahweh did for me when I came out of Egypt' (Ex. $13^{8}$). According to the Mishnah, in a normal family party it was after the second cup that the child put the

[1] Merx's argument, p. 426, however, is not conclusive.

[2] Οἱ *παραγεγόνασιν οὐχ ὡς εἰς τὰ ἄλλα συμπόσια χαριούμενοι γαστρὶ δι' οἴνου καὶ ἐδεσμάτων, ἀλλὰ πάτριον ἔθος ἐκπληρώσαντες μετ' εὐχῶν τε καὶ ὕμνων. De Septen.* 18 (Mangey, ii. 292).

[3] For the possible bearing on this question of the New Testament narratives of the Last Supper, see ch. xxv.

question, 'What is the difference between this and other nights?' and the father replies, beginning with the sufferings and ending with the glorious deliverance which the night commemorated, and expounding in particular the passage beginning, 'A wandering Aramaean was thy father', Dt. $26^{5ff.}$ (Pes. $10^{4}$). Unfortunately the Mishnah does not describe the procedure in relation to the Haggadah when the company consisted exclusively of adults.

The compilation of the Mishnah is about A. D. 200; but it cites on this matter Rabban Gamaliel, apparently the first of that name, the contemporary of St. Paul. Rabban Gamaliel said,[1] 'Every one who at Passover does not speak of three things has failed to fulfil his duty, and these things are the Passover (victim), the unleavened cakes, and bitter herbs; the Paschal victim because God passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt; the unleavened bread because they were redeemed; bitter herbs because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our fathers in Egypt.... Therefore are we bound to give thanks to, to praise, to laud, to glorify, to exalt, and to magnify Him who wrought for us and our fathers all these miracles (נסים) and brought us out of slavery into liberty. And we should say before Him Halleluiah.'

The Paschal meal then was commemorative of past redemption, of the interposition of God at the beginning of Israel's history; and the chief ancient constituents of the meal—the Paschal victim, the unleavened cakes, the bitter herbs—were commemorative symbols whose meaning was expanded during the meal. If we knew no more than this it would be scarcely possible to overlook or to overestimate the probability that this commemoration of the *past* fired the minds of the participants with hopes for the *future*: for a new interposition of Providence which should set them free from their present servitude.

But there is really no room for doubt that this element was already more than latent as early as the first century A. D. Later it is extremely prominent, giving rise, for example, to the formula: 'This year, here, next year in the land of Israel: this year slaves, next year free men all.' The extent to which this class of idea gained definite expression earlier turns on the question of the antiquity of the use of the Hallel, i.e. Pss. 113–118, at the Paschal

[1] Pes. $10^{5a, c}$.

meal. This is certainly older, considerably older, than the Mishnah; for (1) the Mishnah refers to differences in the use of it: according to Beth Shammai only Ps. 113, according to Beth Hillel also Ps. 114, was sung after the second cup, the remainder according to both schools being sung after the fourth cup;[1] (2) the passage already cited from Gamaliel I 'we should say Halleluiah' implies the use of the Hallel, and if the ascription of the saying to Gamaliel be correct, implies its use by at most before the middle of the first century A. D.; (3) the Mishnah (Pes. $10^6$) says the Hallel should conclude with a benediction for redemption[2] and cites two formulas, one upheld by Akiba († A. D. 135), the other by his contemporary Tarphon (Trypho). The formula maintained by Trypho may be more ancient: it runs 'Blessed is he who redeemed us and our fathers from Egypt and has brought us to this night'. Akiba's longer form is obviously later than A. D. 70, and runs: 'So may the Lord our God and the God of our fathers bring us to other festivals, which shall come round to us (לרגלים הבאים לקראתנו), in peace, and in joy for the rebuilding (of the Temple), to eat of the Paschal victims and (other) sacrificial victims whose blood reaches the wall of thine altar acceptably: and we will thank thee for our redemption. Blessed art thou O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel.' But if in even the briefer form the Benediction of redemption be later than A. D. 70, the probability that the singing of the Hallel itself is earlier than A. D. 70 and reaches back at least far into the first century A. D. is great. But if so, added to the recitation during the evening of God's redemptive act in history at the Exodus was prayer and song that in unambiguous terms expressed the hope and the passionate conviction that Israel would not always as now be in servitude to the nations. These were among the strains that closed the meal, 'The Lord is on my side, I will not fear what men can do unto me. . . . All nations compassed me about, but in the name of the Lord I will cut them off. The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation. . . . The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tents of the righteous: the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly. . . . I shall not die but live, and declare the works of the Lord . . . . The stone

[1] Pes. $10^6$.

[2] Cp. Merx, p. 420.

which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. . . . Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.'[1]

Doubtless the Paschal meal, like other religious rites, was discharged by different companies with much difference of spirit, meaning, and emotion. To some it was pre-eminently a meal, a festal meal, with abundance of fare as well as certain unusual elements in the menu, and with abundance of wine. In some cases the sacred meal may even have been marked by excess. To others the Paschal meal, like other elements in the Jewish ritual, was doubtless pre-eminently the fulfilment of a commandment; God had commanded the rites, and without inquiring as to the meaning of the rites or caring for anything beyond they performed the rites as divine commands. But to those to whom it was neither merely a meal nor merely a succession of rites, but far more, who came, as Philo says, not to gratify the belly but to fulfil their ancestral custom *with prayers and songs of praise*, what did it mean? It was a *sacrificial* meal; but how much did that mean in these later times? Negatively it must be said that there is not a tittle of evidence that any sense survived that the eating of the Paschal flesh was an act of communion; if in that idea the custom of sacrificial meals arose, it has grown dim; neither Jubilees nor Philo, nor Josephus nor the Mishnah give any hint that the company assembled in order by or through the eating in itself of the Paschal victim to renew their spiritual life or to ward off dangers. When Beer (*Pesachim*, p. 100) says: 'The Paschal meal is a mystic meal which, working like a mysterious medicine, gives the participants immunity for a year from all dangers, unites them with one another and at the same time with their God Yahweh, who is induced by the abundance of sacrificial blood flowing in his honour to fulfil the darling dream of his people', he is associating ideas with Passover which *may* have attached to it in primitive ages, but which there is nothing to show still attached to it, whereas there are definite indications that other ideas prevailed. The one passage which in addition to modern theories of the *original* idea of sacrifice Beer seems to have in mind is that passage in Jubilees which sees in Passover a means of gaining immunity for a year. But Jubilees gives not

[1 Ps. 118[6, 10, 14 f., 17, 22, 26].]

the slightest hint that this immunity came from any mysterious Paschal medicine; to that writer at least the whole virtue of Passover lies in the fact that it is a divine command: 'No plague shall come upon them to slay or to smite in that year in which they celebrate the Passover in its season *in every respect according to His command*.... Every man shall eat it in the sanctuary of your God ... for thus it is written and ordained that they should eat it in the sanctuary of the Lord.'[1]

The Paschal victim was not in this later age a mysterious medicine. Yet for other reasons, and as a result of elements that had been introduced into the celebration in the course of the long history of the rite, the meal was still a great solemn occasion, charged with historical associations calculated to kindle and nourish religious emotions. It was at once historical in character and eschatological. It appealed by symbol, exposition, and song to a great redemptive act in the past as the pledge of a great redemptive act in the future.

[1 Jub. 49[15, 16].]

# XXV

## PASSOVER AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

As in the Old Testament, so also in the New Testament, Passover is mentioned more frequently than any other festival of the Jews. But the mere frequency of reference in the New Testament is not the reason that Passover has left a deeper mark than other Jewish festivals on Christian terminology and Christian thought. This must rather be sought in the fact that the supreme acts of our Lord's life coincided with the Passover season—a fact which at once accounts for the great majority of the uses of the term 'Passover' and of the *explicit* references to the festival in the New Testament. These explicit references number thirty-one. Of these, twenty-two occur in the narratives of the Passion—four in Matthew, five in Mark, six in Luke, and seven in John. Of the remaining references, four—one in Luke[1] and three in John[2]—occur in definitions of the date of events in earlier years of our Lord's life; two date events in the early history of the Church in the narrative of Acts,[3] one occurs in the historical survey of the heroes of faith in Heb. $11^{28}$, and the remaining reference is, in 1 Cor. $5^{7}$, where the term used, not of course of the Paschal festival, but, according to Biblical and frequent Rabbinic usage, of the Paschal victim is applied to Christ.

To what extent Passover is indirectly referred to in the New Testament, or what we may term Paschal practice or ideas may have affected the practice or thought of the New Testament, turns largely on the exact significance of the explicit references and the exact nature of the transference of ideas from the older to the younger religion where association of some kind is unmistakable. I propose to complete my present course of lectures by some discussion of this interesting but difficult question—difficult in no small degree because of the wealth of discussion and the

[1] $2^{41}$.  [2] $2^{13, 23}$, $6^{4}$.  [3] $12^{4}$, $20^{6}$ (ἀζύμων).

prodigality of theories that have been lavished on various aspects of it, and the large degree of uncertainty as to details that remains, in spite of all the discussion and investigation that have been devoted to them.

It will be convenient first to summarize certain conclusions reached in the previous lectures. Passover originally referred to the rites performed on a single day, or rather during a single night; later, after this ritual had come to coincide in time with the first of the seven days during which leavened bread was taboo and which was termed the Feast (*Hag*) of Unleavened Bread, the term 'Passover' covered the whole period of seven days. At all periods, perhaps, and certainly in the later, 'Passover' was applied either to the celebration or period of celebration, in other words to the *festival*, or to the *victim*, which in the later periods was thus sharply distinguished from the large quantity of other victims that were sacrificed during the entire period of seven days, which were never designated 'Passover', nor were subjected to the peculiar ritual of the Passover victim. In the earlier stage of the history that can be clearly discerned the Paschal ritual consisted of two elements—the application of the Paschal blood to the outside of houses, and the consumption of the Paschal meal within. Possibly these two elements were not of equal antiquity, and probably for a time at least the blood ritual became the more prominent, and was regarded as possessing the chief virtue. The purpose of the early blood ritual was not kathartic but apotropaic; it was designed not to 'unsin' or purify the house, but to keep something unwelcome out of it. This blood ritual was already obsolescent by the seventh century, and must have passed out of use not so long afterwards; yet the apotropaic idea that had been associated with it survived in at least some quarters, and appears at the end of the second century B. C., and may have survived in the form of a belief that a punctilious discharge of the ordinances regulating the surviving Paschal ritual kept plague and calamity at bay. The blood ritual of later times was entirely different; the blood was poured away at the base of the altar; associated with this was, not perhaps very vividly, the thought of a gift to God (*korbān*), but so far as our evidence goes no belief in any special kathartic value in this blood. With the obsolescence of the original blood

ritual, the meal rises into and henceforward remains the supreme element in the Paschal ritual. This meal, originally consumed at home, was by Deuteronomy transferred to the Temple area where it was still eaten in the second century B.C. (Jubilees), but by the first century A.D., though it was obligatory to eat it in Jerusalem, it was no longer eaten in the Temple. The idea associated with the meal in the earliest times is matter of speculation. In Deuteronomy it already assumes a commemorative character, and this is strengthened subsequently; to it by the first century A.D. there was added a strong eschatological element.

The Paschal ritual was complete before the midnight that fell within the first twenty-four hours of the combined festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread. On not the next morning but the morning next but one, according to the *practice* of the first century A.D., the sheaf of firstfruits was offered at the Temple. The later days of the festival are without interest in connexion with the N.T.; interest gathers exclusively round the first three days of the festival. What then in brief was the normal sequence of events on these first three days? By the day of the month these days are the 14th, 15th, and 16th of Nisan, each day beginning not of course with midnight, but with *sunset*.

As the sun of the 13th of Nisan set, and the shades of evening with which the 14th of Nisan began were falling, all scrupulous Jews busied themselves with the search for leaven, or anything containing it, which might perchance have fallen into out-of-the-way corners or crannies (Pes. $1^1$); this was with a view to the removal of all leaven before the next evening, that of the fifteenth, with which the period of taboo on leavened bread began. Leaven was not necessarily removed from the house as early as this evening; on the other hand, up till the following midday, i.e. midday of Nisan 14, leavened bread could be eaten and handled.[1] Thus Nisan 14 was not one of the days on which unleavened bread must be used in lieu of leavened bread, and it could only be called 'the day of unleavened bread' (Jos. *B. J.*, v. $3^1$), or 'the first day of unleavened bread' (Mk. $14^{12}$) because the terms Unleavened Bread and Passover had come to be used indifferently for the festival as a whole,

[1] Pes. $1^4$, $2^{1ff.}$

both the shorter part that was strictly Passover and the longer part that was strictly Unleavened Bread, although these two parts, so far as the closing hours of Nisan 14 were concerned, were not identical.

Shortly after midday on Nisan 14, according not only to the Mishnah but also Philo and Josephus, the slaughter of the Paschal victims at the Temple began and continued till near sundown. During the afternoon of Nisan 14, moreover, it was customary to abstain from ordinary work, and to devote oneself to the preparation of what was required on the following day.[1]

After sunset on Nisan 14, in what were now the evening hours of Nisan 15, the Paschal meal was eaten. During the whole of Nisan 15, the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread taken strictly, all 'servile work' was forbidden by Scripture (Num. $28^{18}$), and though the prohibition is less universal than that of work on the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement, it covered, according to traditional interpretation, most ordinary occupations, so much so that, as we saw in the lecture on the sheaf, a large body of opinion held that the 15th of Nisan, the first day of unleavened bread, was a sabbath.

On the day following this, i.e. on the 16th of Nisan, according to the practice of the first century A.D., the sheaf of firstfruits was offered at the Temple some time before noon.

We have next to see, though it necessitates covering, however rapidly, some familiar ground, how the two different representations, which prima facie at least appear in the narratives of the Synoptics, on the one hand, and of John, with whom from allusions we may gather that Paul went, too, on the other, can be harmonized.

In considering this we must constantly bear in mind that the N.T. narratives, unlike the later narratives of the O.T. and Josephus, never date events by the day of the month. The various events are dated by the day of the week, or the days of the festival; consequently, whenever if for convenience we speak in connexion with the events of Passion week of the 14th, 15th, or 16th of Nisan we are using terms which are inferential.

According to John, six days before the Passover our Lord came to Bethany ($12^{1}$), and supped in the house of Lazarus at

[1] Pes. $4^{1}$.

Bethany ($12^2$): the next day the great multitude gathered in Jerusalem for the festival welcome him ($12^{12}$) as he enters the city with words taken from the first Paschal hymn, 'Hosanna: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord' ($12^{13}$). The subsequent narrative mentions no return from Jerusalem to Bethany, and so far implies that the remaining days and nights were spent in Jerusalem. Still before the festival of Passover, Jesus sups with the twelve; the time of this supper is so far directly stated in $13^1$ and implied in $13^{29}$ when it is said that some supposed, when Judas left the supper table, that he had gone to buy requisites for the festival. The subsequent narrative implies that it was the night *immediately* preceding that of the Paschal meal. The place is not directly stated, but is implied to have been Jerusalem (above and $18^1$). It is more than once stated that the participants of the supper *reclined* ($13^{12, 23, 25}$). Bread was partaken of and a dish is referred to ($13^{26}$), and during the supper our Lord discoursed on the vine.

After supper Jesus, with his disciples, goes out of the city across the Kidron, is betrayed, captured, brought before Annas and Caiaphas, and then to the outside of the Praetorium. The Jews abstain from going into the Praetorium ($18^{28}$) in order to avoid being rendered unclean, and so prevented from eating the Paschal victim (*φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*), which was due to be eaten the next evening, as the subsequent narrative, not in these terms, but quite clearly, indicates when it records ($19^{14}$) that it was the 'Preparation for the Passover' (*παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*), a technical term (Heb. ערב הפסח) for the 14th of Nisan, the day on which the Paschal victim was slain in readiness for eating it in the evening with which the next day, Nisan 15, began. The crucifixion, according to John, began after the sixth hour, i. e. noon ($19^{14}$), on the day of the Preparation; and Jesus died and was entombed the same afternoon before sunset ($19^{31, 42}$). The day following the crucifixion was not only the 15th of Nisan, on which the Passover was *eaten*, it was also a sabbath ($19^{31}$); on the next day to this, Sunday, the 16th of Nisan, early in the morning before it was light, the tomb was empty and Jesus was risen ($20^1$).

Everything in this narrative fits in minutely with Jewish Paschal custom; the references to the meal taken by Jesus with

his disciples would have been satisfied by the customs of the Paschal meal, but they do not require it: they are satisfied also by the customs of more ordinary meals. The one fact which might have pointed strongly to the meal being, though even so without proving it actually to have been, the Paschal meal, is the fact that it was eaten in Jerusalem; but this entirely loses its force when we confine our attention to the Johannine narrative alone, for that brings Jesus to Jerusalem five days before Passover, and does not refer to his leaving the city subsequently.

In John's narrative there are, then, two striking coincidences, though neither of these is explicitly, and one is not even remotely, indicated. The crucifixion and death of Jesus take place during the hours devoted to the slaughter and presentation of the Paschal victims at the Temple; the resurrection of Jesus takes place on the day on which the sheaf of firstfruits was presented at the Temple. There are indications that the first of these coincidences was present to the mind of the author. It is in the immediate prelude to the crucifixion that he remarks 'it was the Preparation for the Passover'; as below, he might have spoken merely of the Preparation ($19^{31}$), or, since it was also this, of the Preparation for the Sabbath; but the term chosen is that which would inevitably spring to the mind of a Jew who was thinking of the slaughter of the Paschal victims, and would immediately suggest this to Jewish readers. The Preparation for the Passover is the day *before* that on which the Paschal victim is *eaten*; it is the day *on* which the victim was *slain*, and the hour of slaughter was between noon and sunset. As the narrative of the crucifixion opens with this significantly worded note, so it closes with the application to our Lord of the words taken from the Paschal law of Exodus that 'not a bone of it shall be broken' ($19^{36}$; Ex. $12^{46}$).

Thus there certainly seems to have been present to the mind of the author the thought that Jesus dying at the hour of the slaughter of the Paschal victim was himself a Paschal victim, the true Passover. And the same thought, though without reference to the coincidence of times which, however, was probably not actually absent from his mind, is clearly expressed by Paul. Paul says of the Last Supper merely that it was taken 'in the night in which Jesus was betrayed' without associating it either with the Paschal festival in general or any particular night in

relation to it. On the other hand, elsewhere, he terms Jesus both Passover, i. e. Paschal victim—'our Paschal victim is slain for us, even Christ' (1 Cor. $5^7$), and firstfruits—*Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων . . . ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός* (1 Cor. $15^{20}$).

Certainly it would be hazardous in the extreme to infer from Paul's thought alone that in the story as reconstructed by him Jesus died at the Passover season; he might have been led to both assertions along other lines; but with the evidence of John before us we may conclude that as a matter of fact his mind had dwelt on the two coincidences, that Jesus died at the hour of the Paschal sacrifice and rose on the morning when the firstfruits were being offered in the Temple.

If the Johannine narrative is read by itself in the light of Jewish Paschal custom, all is straightforward; the Last Supper is neither said nor implied to be the Paschal meal; on the other hand, the Paschal meal is distinctly implied to have been eaten the next night; the Jews, alike the priests with those hostile to Jesus and Joseph of Arimathea act in accordance with the customs of the day *preceding* the Paschal meal, but in constant violation of what would have been required had it been the day after the Paschal meal. To avoid any infringement of the stringent prohibition of work on that day, the body of Jesus, removed from the cross late in the afternoon before the Paschal meal, is laid in a tomb ready to hand: 'they put Jesus there, since it was the day of the Preparation, seeing that the tomb was close by' ($19^{42}$). John records no activity on the part of any one on the next day; the narrative passes over the 15th of Nisan, to the early morning of Sunday, the 16th ($20^1$).

When we turn from John to the Synoptics, the case is very different: there are first, on the surface at least, serious differences between John and the Synoptics: but also there are, if possible, more serious inconsistencies with Jewish Paschal custom: and further, there are some signs of internal inconsistency in the common Synoptic tradition. Efforts more or less plausible have been made to explain, or explain away, all these three classes of inconsistencies; it is impossible even to review them now; nor is it necessary. My aim is merely to bring out the salient points of difference.

The first of these is the date of the Last Supper: the date given by all three Synoptics, if it means anything, must mean that the Supper was prepared on the 14th of Nisan and eaten on the evening that began the 15th of Nisan, in other words the evening on which the Passover was legally eaten. This is twenty-four hours later than the date of the Last Supper as indicated by John. The Supper is *prepared* on 'the day (the first day: Mk. $14^{12}$, Mt. $26^{17}$) of unleavened bread', which is more closely defined by Mark as 'when the Paschal victim was sacrificed' (*ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον*); by Luke ($22^{7}$) as '(the day) on which the Passover had to be sacrificed' (*ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τό πάσχα*). In the present form at least of the narratives of Mark and Luke it is clear, scarcely less so in Matthew, that the day assigned for the preparation of the Last Supper is that very day of preparation for the Passover on which according to John the Crucifixion took place.

But if the Last Supper took place, as the Synoptic narratives assert, in the evening on which the Paschal victims were slain, it follows that the betrayal, capture, trial, and crucifixion of our Lord all fell on what was by Jewish reckoning the 15th of Nisan; but (1) on the 15th of Nisan, Jewish Scripture and Jewish traditional law alike required abstention from work: whereas (2) the priests, their attendants, Simon the Cyrenian are all represented as engaged in activities which the law of the day forbade: therefore, unlike the Johannine narrative, the Synoptic narratives are in conflict with Jewish custom, though without displaying the least consciousness of the fact.

But there are some features of the Synoptic narratives that might be, and sometimes have been, interpreted as pointing to internal inconsistencies. It is said that the phrase 'the first day of unleavened bread when the Paschal lamb was sacrificed' (Mk. $14^{12}$, cp. Lk. $22^{7}$) is self-contradictory, since the first day of unleavened bread was the 15th, the day on which the Passover victims were slain the 14th, of Nisan. I cannot here again go over the ground covered in an earlier lecture when I discussed the effect of the union of Passover (= the 14th of Nisan) and Unleavened Bread (= the 15th to 21st of Nisan) into a single feast called indifferently by the name of either. Here it must suffice (1) to recall that the exact equivalent to the supposed self-contradictory term in Mark and Luke occurs in Josephus, *B. J.*, v. 3, who

speaks of 'the day of Unleavened Bread, being the fourteenth day of the month', though as a matter of fact, unleavened bread was not eaten till the fifteenth; and (2) that either part of the supposed self-contradictory term is equally in conflict with the Jewish custom, for on the 15th of Nisan—if that were what is *here* meant by the (first) day of Unleavened Bread—it would have been impossible to prepare the Passover, since the Passover had been already eaten, and if the meal was prepared in the ordinary course on the day on which the Paschal victims were slain, then violations of the law of rest enjoined for the 15th of Nisan still remain in the subsequent narrative.

Are there inconsistencies in the description of the Supper itself? In other words, do certain features in the description require, and certain others exclude, a Paschal meal? That certain features require us to understand a Paschal meal should be beyond dispute. All three Gospels alike in the narrative of the *preparation* speak of the Supper as the Passover (τὸ πάσχα, Mt. 26[17], Lk. 22[8], Mk. 14[12]) and employ the technical Jewish term 'to eat the Passover'; in the account of the Supper itself neither Matthew nor Mark speaks of it as the Passover, but Luke records the saying of our Lord at supper time, 'I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you' (Lk. 22[15]). Many of the details—the reclining, the wine, the dipping in the dish—are indifferent as between the Paschal and other meals; but the concluding hymn, if it does not absolutely require, is strongly suggestive of Passover, and there is another matter of the same nature which has been less emphasized than it might have been: this is that the Supper is eaten in Jerusalem. Unlike John, the Synoptics represent our Lord as spending the nights of the last week outside Jerusalem, and from outside the city on the last day he sends the disciples to prepare the meal within the city. If the meal was to be a Passover and not a deliberate violation of the law, this was necessary, and so obvious to a Jew that it was unnecessary explicitly to state that a room must be found in Jerusalem since the supper was to be the Passover meal: the Last Supper could not have been eaten where our Lord had supped on the previous nights. On the other hand, if it was not a Passover there is no obvious reason why the previous night's lodging was abandoned on this one.

That any features in the Synoptic description of the *meal* are inconsistent with its having been a Passover is not clear; though there are certainly features which do not in themselves suggest the Paschal meal and some that required explanation if the meal was Paschal. Most remarkable is the fact that neither Mark nor Matthew refers to the central feature of the Jewish Passover meal, viz. the roasted Paschal flesh. This is according to Jewish usage implied, not to say most immediately referred to, in the words in Luke, 'I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you'. If Matthew and Mark represent the common basis of the Synoptic tradition, then in that basis the Paschal victim was not mentioned in the account of the Last Supper, and Luke's addition has the effect of giving greater emphasis to the view common to the Passion narratives of all three Gospels in their present form, that the Last Supper was a Passover. Another point of which much use was made in earlier controversies is the term used in the narratives for 'bread': this is always the general term ἄρτος and ἄζυμα, corresponding to the Hebrew לחם and מצות; now it is on the one hand certain that in Hebrew the general includes the special term, that מצות unleavened loaves could be called לחם bread; but on the other hand, to judge from usage in the Jewish sources, it was customary not to use the general but the special term in speaking of the Paschal meal: at the same time it is not conclusive. A third point, of which Beer (p. 971, n. 1) has made much, is the use of the single cup in the Synoptic narrative as against the use of separate cups for each person at the Paschal meal. Possibly, even if this is as clearly a departure from Paschal ritual as Beer argues that it is, it can, like the absence in Matthew and Mark of reference to the Paschal victim, be explained otherwise than by assuming that the narratives rest on an earlier form in which the meal was not Paschal.

Into the historical question whether our Lord was crucified on the 14th or on the 15th of Nisan, and whether the Last Supper was or was not a Paschal meal, I need not enter further here. Historically, if the Last Supper was a Paschal meal, our Lord cannot have been crucified at the hour when the Paschal victims were being slaughtered; but what is as a matter of *fact* impossible is in the world of ideas possible. And early in the history of the Christian Church both these ideas were

current: that the Last Supper was a Paschal meal, that out of the Jewish Paschal meal the Christian Eucharist sprang, and that our Lord died at the hour of the Paschal sacrifice, himself a Paschal victim of nobler name than they. I conclude with a brief consideration of the influence on these beliefs of Jewish ideas: how far were the Jewish ideas gathering round the Paschal victim or the Paschal meal taken over, abandoned, or modified by the new religion?

I take first what we may call the Synoptic theory, that the Christian Eucharistic meal was instituted at a Paschal meal, at a meal eaten at all events at the time when the Paschal meal was being eaten in the houses of Jerusalem. What was instituted on that evening according to the Synoptists was an institution which perpetuated certain features identical with, or closely resembling, certain features of a Paschal meal, but with certain other features left out. The most striking omission is that of the Paschal victim, in other words of the sacrificial element. The Christian institution, like the Jewish Paschal meal after the cessation of sacrifice in A.D. 70, is divorced from sacrifice; the flesh of the sacrificial victim which was originally the primary, if not the sole constituent of the Paschal meal, and with the Jews remained a regular constituent of it down to the destruction of the Temple, though with a greatly diminished importance in relation to the entire ritual of the meal, could no longer form part of the Jewish Passover after A.D. 70, and did actually form no part of the Christian Supper or Eucharist from the first. None of the narratives of the Last Supper assigns to the Paschal victim any place in the new Christian institution. Ought we, however, to say that the Paschal victim of the Jewish rite is perpetuated in the Christian rite under the symbols of bread and wine? This carries us on to the features of the Jewish Paschal meal that were perpetuated or have their analogies in the Christian institution. Among these stand out prominently and directly the bread and the wine or cup; certainly, as we have seen, there is in bread and wine nothing exclusively characteristic of the Paschal meal; so far as these elements in the Christian institution are concerned, it might just as well have developed, as Dr. Box has suggested,[1] out

[1] *J. T. S.*, April 1902, vol. iii. pp. 357 ff.

of the Ḳiddush, the meal made a little more elaborate than the ordinary week-day meal by the presence of the wine, with which incoming Sabbaths and festivals were consecrated. And even if as a matter of history the Christian institution was founded at a Paschal meal, no stress is laid on perpetuating in the new institution the *peculiar* bread that was essential to the old; on the other hand, the exclusive use of the term ἄρτος and the avoidance of ἄζυμα rather suggests that the bread used in the Christian institution was not to be any rare kind of bread regulated by any special ritual law, but the simple, daily bread that formed the staple of man's food. As was bread to man's bodily life, so was the body it symbolized to the spiritual life of those who fed upon it—a daily spiritual sustenance.

That red wine recalled, or was used as a substitute for blood, is well-known: wine, the Hebrews thought, was the blood of the grape. There is, therefore, so far nothing fresh or unusual when the Eucharistic formula symbolizes blood by means of wine, or identifies wine with blood. But the entire formula in no way suggests that the bread and wine are a Christian equivalent of the Jewish Paschal victim. or for that matter of any other Jewish sacrificial victim. Whatever may have been the case in remote ages, long before the Christian era, blood, whether that of a sacrificial victim or any other, had long since ceased to be drunk by the Jews, and the custom was looked on by them with horror. The command, therefore, to drink by means of wine the blood of Christ was not suggested by any existing Jewish or Paschal rite; since this is so, it is not very much to the point to lay stress, as e. g. Dr. Stone [1] does, on the use of the word ἐκχυνόμενον applied to the blood of Christ; it is perfectly true that this word is used of the Paschal blood in the latter ritual, and of the blood of certain other victims which was *poured out* and tossed away not on but at the foot of the altar, but the Hebrew שׁפך which it renders is not exclusively a sacrificial term, and the Greek ἐκχέω is of very common usage, rendering in the LXX many Hebrew terms and being used in the LXX and N.T. with great frequency in non-sacrificial as well as sacrificial connexion, as for example of the outpouring of blood in murder, the outpouring of wine, water, &c. There are certainly other expres-

[1] Cp. *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, pp. 22, 61, 68.

sions which could have been chosen if the formula was originally suggested by the blood ritual of Jewish sacrifice. We must therefore conclude that if and in so far as the bread and wine of the Christian Eucharist, as referred to in the accounts of its institution, connect with the Jewish Paschal meal, they connect with the bread and wine, which had come to play an important part in it, but not with the animal victim. Bread and wine were in certain cases offered on the Jewish altar: the bread and wine of the Paschal meal were not. It is, therefore, if from any, from the non-sacrificial elements in the Paschal meal that the Christian Eucharist derives its symbols.

But bread and wine were, as we have already noted, not exclusively characteristic of the Paschal meal. It is in combination of these with other features that proof of the relation of the Christian institution to the Jewish must be sought. And these additional points of contact exist precisely where, as I pointed out in the last lecture, the chief religious elements in the later Jewish Paschal meal are to be found—in the commemorative and eschatological character of both institutions. The commemorative character and intention of the Christian institution is expressed in two phrases: in the εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, *for my memorial*, or *in memory of me* (1 Cor. 11[25], Lk. 22[19], not Mk., Mt.), and in the τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε (1 Cor. 11[26] only), 'ye proclaim' or 'tell the story of the death of the Lord': καταγγέλλω is, as has been pointed out, the exact equivalent of the Hebrew הגיד; and the recitation of the story of the death of the Lord, in other words of the act of redemption in which the Christian Church originates and on which it depends, corresponds exactly to the Haggadah at the Jewish Paschal meal, the recitation of the act of redemption from Egypt on which the Jewish nation depended. The other phrase which I have cited has indeed been otherwise explained. Dr. Stone sees in the ἀνάμνησις another of the links in the Christian institution with the Jewish sacrificial ritual; he suggests that the term is the equivalent here of the Jewish sacrificial term אזכרה and points out that ἀνάμνησις, which occurs but five times in all in the LXX, once actually corresponds to אזכרה and twice in obscure Psalm titles may refer to this form of offering. This theory does not appear to me probable: I must here content myself with pointing out that the

אזכרה was an inconspicuous feature in the Jewish ritual; in the O.T. it is mentioned only in P; it had no place whatever in the Paschal ritual. The etymology of the term is not certain, though on this point little stress need be laid, since the LXX rendering shows how it was at least sometimes understood: but what I should lay most stress on is that Dr. Stone really leaves the *ἐμήν* unexplained; 'for my memorial' should mean, on the analogy of the only similar construction cited by him from the LXX, 'to call me to remembrance'; whereas if the phrase had been used sacrificially we should have expected 'Do', or as Dr. Stone would prefer, 'offer this *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, as a fresh memorial offering'.

The eschatological element is briefly but clearly indicated by the phrase *ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ* (1 Cor. 11[26] only) 'until he come'. As the Jews at their Paschal meal recalled one act of redemption as the pledge of another and final act of redemption in the future, so the Christian looked back to and recited the story of the Cross as the pledge of the future coming of the Lord and the consummation of their redemption.

It is a curious fact that the expression of the historical element is peculiar to Paul and to what is sometimes regarded as a Pauline interpretation in Luke, and that the eschatological element is peculiar to Paul, for the eschatological references in the Gospels refer to the actual Last Supper and not to subsequent observations then enjoined. But this does not affect the main fact, for which Corinthians is sufficient evidence, that within twenty years of its institution the Christian rite possessed four elements of the Jewish Paschal meal: bread and wine, and those two elements in which the chief religious value of the Jewish rite had come to lie—the solemn commemoration of the past, and based on that the inextinguishable hope for the future.

But into the Christian ritual there did not enter the eating of the Paschal victim. This fact has of course to be considered in connexion with other main Paschal connexions in early Christian thought. And here, again, the Christian idea already appears in St. Paul, and with him scarcely as a new idea, viz. that Christ himself was the Paschal victim slain for the Christian community. The same identification though not explicitly made seems unmistakably indicated in the Johannine narrative of the

Passion. The same identification has sometimes been sought also at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, and it is tempting to find it as at once the opening and culminating description of our Lord in the work. But as against this, there are two powerful objections to concluding that 'the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world' is a description of Christ as a Paschal victim: the Paschal victim was, as I showed in a former lecture, neither as a matter of fact necessarily a lamb, nor in the usage of the time was it called a lamb; the proper term for it was 'Passover', and it is only reasonable to suppose that had the author of the Fourth Gospel intended this he would, like St. Paul, have used the correct and unambiguous designation. And the second objection is that the Paschal victim was not a sin-offering or regarded as a means of expiating or removing sins.

What then are we to say of the identification or comparison of Christ with the Paschal victim? A full discussion cannot now be undertaken. But in the Johannine Passion narrative it seems to have been suggested by, rather than to have suggested, the coincidence in time between the death of Jesus and the sacrifice of the Passover, and there is no suggestion of a recurring Paschal sacrifice within the Christian community. With St. Paul, too, the annual Jewish sacrifices and subsequent festal week do not appear to have suggested a recurrent Christian sacrifice and festal season. For him the Christian Passover is slain once for all; the feast that follows is an enduring feast. The Jews slew a Passover for each small company and substituted unleavened for leavened bread for a week in every year. The Christian Passover is slain for the whole Christian community once for all, and what follows on it should be perpetual substitution of simplicity and truth for malice and hatred.[1]

If and in so far as no sacrificial elements entered into the earliest Christian Eucharist, the suggestion or germs of them must be sought elsewhere than in the Jewish Paschal sacrifice: for the Synoptic Gospels, which trace the origin of the Eucharist to a meal partaken of on Passover night, give no hint that the sacrificial element in the Jewish meal was to be perpetuated; and St. Paul and St. John, who speak of our Lord as a Paschal victim, do not bring this idea into relation with the Eucharist.

[1 1 Cor. 5$^{7}$ f.]

# APPENDIX I

## NOTE ON MATERIAL OF SACRIFICE

[See also pp. 21 ff.]

Regarded from the standpoint of material used, sacred offerings fall into two broad classes: (1) the animal or bloody offering; (2) the vegetable or bloodless offering. In early Hebrew usage there is no precise terminology to cover this distinction: the term מנחה, which later (in P) became a technical term for cereal offerings only, is used comprehensively of all sacred offerings.[1] The earlier and comprehensive use is natural, for, whether derived from the root *mnḥ, to give*, or from *nhy, to lead*, the term was used without sacrificial connotation of *gifts* to human recipients, in particular of a 'complimentary present, or a present made to secure or retain good-will'.[2]

### *Vegetable or Bloodless Offerings.*

Tithes were offered of vegetable produce in general (Dt. $14^{22}$); and the crops from which firstfruits (בכורים) or the first (ראשית) were offered are referred to in general terms in the early legislation (Ex. $23^{19}$, cp. v.$^{16}$, $22^{28}$ [E.V. $^{29}$]) and Dt. $26^{2}$, though according to the Mishnah firstfruits (בכורים) were offered of the seven kinds only, i.e. wheat, barley, vines, fig-trees, pomegranates, oil, and honey.[3]

Apart from the laws as to these more special offerings, which for the most part ultimately acquired the character of a tax for the support of the priesthood (see below), there remains one passage which refers to vegetable offerings in the widest terms: 'Cain brought of the fruits of the soil (מפרי האדמה) as an offering to Yahweh'. Although the narrative condemns Cain's offerings, it may be that the ancestors of the Hebrews of the historical period offered to Yahweh, even apart from firstfruits and tithes, a wider variety of vegetable produce than the casual references in the early narratives or the later legislation suggest.

[1] See e. g. Gen. $4^{3-5}$, Num. $16^{15}$, 1 Sam. $2^{17}$, $26^{19}$.

[2] Driver in Hastings' *D. B.* iii. 587 b, who cites the passages in full that illustrate the usage, as e. g. Gen. $32^{14-22}$ [E.V. $^{13-21}$], Jud. $3^{15}$.

[3] Bikkurim, $1^{3}$. Cp. *Numbers*, p. 228.

The bloodless offerings actually alluded to in the early literature consisted of:

(1) Bread (לחם) (1 Sam. $10^{3}$f.). This was commonly unleavened (מצות, Jud. $6^{19-21}$): early laws (Ex. $13^{6,7}$) clearly forbade the use of leavened bread at the spring fast, which took its name חג המצות from the conspicuous part which the eating of unleavened cakes took in it, and according to one interpretation of Ex. $23^{18}$ leaven was forbidden on all sacrificial occasions. On the other hand, Am. $4^{5}$ shows that at Bethel in the eighth century it had become customary to offer and, indeed, to burn on the altar leavened bread (חמץ), and it is not clear that the prophet's condemnation falls on this feature in particular of the ritual. Even in the latest legislation no objection is raised to the use of leavened bread which, though presented at the sanctuary and to Yahweh, was not intended to be consumed on the altar, but to be eaten by the priests as Yahweh's proxies: indeed it is actually required (Lev. $23^{17}$) that the bread prepared from firstfruits should be leavened, and that after presentation before, not on, the altar it should fall to the priests (ib. v.$^{20}$).[1] It is possible that this later distinction corresponds ultimately to two sources of Hebrew ritual—the practice of their Bedouin ancestors whose ordinary bread would have been unleavened, and the practice of the Canaanites who would have made a larger use of leavened bread. Since לחם is a term that covers both leavened (ל' חמץ, Lev. $7^{13}$) and unleavened bread (ל' מצות, Ex. $29^{2}$), it is impossible to determine whether the bread that was being taken to God at Bethel (1 Sam. $10^{3}$), or the bread placed before God in Nob (1 Sam. $21^{4}$ff.), was leavened or unleavened; but in the latter case certainly the bread in question was not burned on the altar but consumed by the priests, and consequently even if it was leavened the custom was not inconsistent with the later law.

(2) Parched ears of corn. The custom of offering these, though first attested in Lev. $2^{14-16}$, was almost certainly ancient. On the other hand, uncooked meal or flour was probably not offered: Hannah's meal (קמח 1 Sam. $1^{24}$) may have been baked at the sanctuary (cp. Ezek. $46^{20}$) before being presented.

(3) Oil in earlier, as in later times (Ezek. $46^{14}$f.; Lev. 2; Ex. $29^{2,40}$) was doubtless used in the preparation of sacrificial cakes, though no actual early reference to this occurs. But in P oil occurs not only as an ingredient in offerings, but in one instance as an independent element (Lev. $14^{10}$ff.); and Mic. $6^{7}$, Gen. $28^{18}$; $35^{14}$ point to a, perhaps,

[1] The unleavened bread of Lev. $7^{13}$ was also presumably not intended for the altar.

more frequent presentation of these independent oil-offerings in earlier times.

(4) Wine was offered,[1] generally if not always,[2] along with an animal[3] or bread.[4] Like the flesh of the peace-offering, most of the wine was probably consumed at the sacrificial meal,[5] only a small portion being retained for the altar.

(5) A custom of offering libations of water to Yahweh has often been inferred[6] from 1 Sam. $7^6$; 2 Sam. $23^{16}$ (1 Chron. $11^{18}$); the latter passage relates that David, unwilling to drink himself the water of Bethlehem which three of his followers had fetched for him at the hazard of their lives, 'poured it out, or made a libation of it, to Yahweh'; here the same technical term[7] is used as is used elsewhere for the offering of wine or other liquid sacrificially, but the context scarcely admits of the water having been poured out by David at an altar of Yahweh. In 1 Sam. $7^6$ the people, assembled at Mizpah to fast and make confession of sin, are said to have 'drawn water and poured it out (וישפכו) before Yahweh'. Mizpah possessed an altar, and 'before Yahweh' often, though by no means always, virtually means 'in the sanctuary', 'before the altar'

[1] To Yahweh, Hos. $9^4$; cp. Gen. $35^{14}$ (E), 2 Ki. $16^{13, 15}$ where the נסך probably consisted of wine, though in itself נסך (verb or noun) may refer not only to wine as regularly in P), but also to outpourings or libations of water (2 Sam. $23^{16}$, 1 Chron. $11^{18}$), blood (Ps. $16^4$), and probably oil (Ezek. $45^{17}$; cp. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, ii. 208). For wine offered to other deities, see Jer. $7^{18}$, $19^{13}$, $32^{29}$, $44^{17-19, 25}$, Ezek. $20^{28}$. Cp. the implication of Jud. $9^{12 f.}$

[2] Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.*[2], p. 364, detects evidence of an independent wine-offering in Gen. $35^{14}$ (see last note)—though this is at least combined with an oil-offering.

[3] Hos. $9^4$ where יין יסכו לי֫ and לו זבחיהם (so read for יערכו) יערכו are parallel clauses; cp. 2 Ki. $6^{13, 15}$; also 1 Sam. $10^3$; so in the worship of other gods, wine and זבחים are associated in Dt. $32^{38}$, Ezek. $20^{28}$; and קטר, in Jer. $19^{13}$, $32^{29}$, $44^{17-19, 25}$, may point to the association with libations of animal sacrifice.

[4] Cp. Jer. $7^{18}$.

[5] The clearest proof of this is Dt. $32^{38}$, which refers to the worship of other gods. But the consumption of wine by the worshippers of Yahweh is sufficiently indicated by 1 Sam. $1^{14}$, Isa. $28^{7 f.}$ The phrase used for making sacrificial offering of wine is (חסיך) נסך נסכים; but this no more necessarily implies that all the wine was retained for the altar than the corresponding phrase זבח זבח ים ליהוה (Ex. $24^5$, 1 Sam. $6^{15}$; cp. Gen. $46^1$, 1 Sam $1^{21}$, 1 Ki. $8^{62}$, 1 Sam. $11^{15}$, Dt. $16^2$ and (to Dagon) Jud. $16^{23}$) implies that the whole of the flesh of the זבח was retained for the altar.

[6] So e. g. Nowack, ii. 209; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.*[2], 364.

[7] ויסך (Hiph.) in Samuel: וינסך (Pi'el) in Chronicles. The Pi'el is unique; the Hiph'il is common. In Hos. $9^4$ MT points as Ḳal.

(see e.g. 1 Sam. $11^{15}$; Lev. $1^{5}$; $3^{1}$). It is therefore easiest to interpret the passage of an offering of water; the fact that the verb שפך and not נסך is used is not conclusive against this, for in Is. $57^{6}$ שפך is used with נסך as an object, and in Sir. $50^{15}$ the high-priest is described first as making a libation (נסך) of the blood of the grape and then pouring (שפך) it away at the base of the altar. The alternative interpretation of the passage which sees in the outpouring of the water a 'symbolical act implying a complete separation from sin'[1] may be right, but it is certainly not at all clearly suggested by the context. In the later Jewish observance of the Feast of Booths it was customary to make libations of water on the altar, but whether this is directly connected with such practices as 1 Sam. $7^{6}$, 2 Sam. $23^{16}$ point to, is uncertain.

If water-libations actually were offered by the Israelites in the early days of the monarchy, we may see in the custom a survival from the nomadic period, which gradually gave way to the Canaanite custom of using wine for libations.[2]

In certain early passages, however, we find in lieu of *minḥah* a combination of two terms *zebaḥ* and *minḥah*,[3] or *'olah* and *minḥah*,[4] to express the idea of sacred offerings in general. In these combinations doubtless *minḥah* covers particularly the bloodless offering, and *zebaḥ* or *'olah* the bloody offerings, but by itself *minḥah* in this period was just as little a general term for all bloodless sacrifices as *'olah* was a general term for all bloody sacrifices; *'olah*, on the other hand, is a quite specific term for a particular class of animal sacrifices, as is *zebaḥ*, generally if not invariably for another particular class, although etymologically *zebaḥ*, *slain* (offering) might very suitably have been used for all offerings consisting of slain animals. Curiously enough in Phoenician זבח, in spite of its obvious etymology, acquired the most general sense of sacred offering,[5] so that in the Marseilles sacrificial tariff we read of זבח שמן, a *sacrifice of oil*.[6]

[1] Dr. who refers to Ehrlich; cp. also Budde and H. P. Smith, ad loc.

[2] So Schwally, *Sem. Kriegsaltertümer*, 55–58.

[3] 1 Sam. $2^{19}$, $3^{14}$, Am. $5^{25}$; and later Is. $19^{21}$.

[4] Jer. $14^{12}$ (? Am. $5^{22}$). Cp. Ps. $20^{4}$.

[5] So apparently also in Assyrian (*KAT*[3] 595, n. 4). Cp. the transference of meaning in the Assyr. *nīḳû* from *drink-offering* to offering in general (ib.); cp. also נסך, *libation*; but نسك gen. *to worship* (rarely *to be-pour*, B. D. B.); نُسُك service of God, نَسِيكة victim, نَسِيبة *sacrificium, victima*: connexion, perhaps libation, of blood (We.); cp. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 213 ff.

[6] *CIS* I. i. $165^{12}$. Cp. $167^{9}$.

(6) In respect of the use of honey in sacred offerings attempts have been made to distinguish between Babylonian and Hebrew custom. 'Honey, cream, milk, fruit occur frequently as Babylonian offerings, but never amongst those of the O.T.'[1] 'Other vegetables, such as e.g. honey, milk, dates, which were offered sacrificially (cp. *Opfer und Abgabe*, p. 342) in Babylon and elsewhere are never mentioned as offerings in the O.T. Honey is in the law expressly forbidden.'[2] 'Honey, among the Israelites . . . might not be added to the offering, but among the Babylonians it was used as the material of (sacred) offerings.'[3]

These comparisons seem to be of things not in the same class. There is (?) no evidence of honey being mingled with cakes burnt on the altar in Babylon, which is what Lev. $2^{11}$ forbids: on the other hand, honey is expressly permitted as a gift of ראשית[4] (קרבן ״): (Lev. $2^{12}$; cp. 2 Chr. $31^{4\,f.}$); it is in sacred offerings of this kind, viz. contributions made for the support of the priests that honey was used by the Babylonians;[5] it figures (e.g. Neb. Grot. i. 13, in *K.B.* III. ii. 32–33) as part of the *sattuku*, which Del. *HWB.* defines as 'beständige regelmässige Tempelabgabe in Opferthieren, Naturalien, Geld, u.s.w.' (otherwise *KAT*², 596, n. 1).

### *Sacrificial Animals* (*in post-exilic times*).

Domestic animals, and of these only such as could be consumed as human food, were normally used for sacrifice; of such animals kine, sheep, and goats of either sex and of various ages or stages of development are definitely mentioned as sacrifices or alluded to in connexions which imply that they were sacrificed. Doves were also used for sacrifice, but whether they were domesticated,[6] or actually consumed as human food,[7] is disputed. On the sacrifices of human beings, see below. The camel commonly sacrificed by the Arabs never appears in the O.T. as a sacrificial

[1] Jeremias in *EBi.* 4124: cp *ATAO*² 429. Cp. for the Hebrew prohibition, W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 203 f.

[2] Benzinger, 363 f. [3] König, *A. T. Rel.* p. 280

[4] Also בכורים, *Numbers*, p. 228.

Yet is honey a sacrifice proper in '*di-iš-pa . . . passaru Nabium u Nana . . udaḫḫid*', 'with honey is the table of Nebo and Nana known to abound' (ibid. ii. 35, in *K.B.* III. ii. 36–37).

[6] Stade, *Gesch.* 1. 494, counts them wild; Nowack, ii. 210. n. 1, domesticated. Cp. Dillmann, *Leviticus*, p. 378.

[7] See *EBi.* where it is pointed out: (1) that no actual reference to the eating of doves occurs in the O.T.—which indeed is not very remarkable; (2) that they are used sacrificially only on occasions which did not involve a sacrificial meal; (3) that doves were taboo in Syria (Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, 54).

victim—not even in the narratives referring to the patriarchs or to the wanderings in the wilderness, and in Dt. $14^7$ is classed among the unclean animals. And again, wild animals, though the gazelle for example was sacrificed by the Arabs and deer (?) and other game by the Phoenicians (Cooke, *NSI*, p. 117, 120), were not admitted as sacrificial victims by the Hebrews: not only is there no reference to such victims, but Dt. $12^{22}$ directly implies that at least neither gazelle nor hart, though both were 'clean' animals (Dt. $14^7$), had ever been (as far as the memory of man ran) used as peace-offerings.

The following terms occur in reference to sacrificial victims:—

1. Animals of the bovine kind.

(*a*) בקר the collective term for oxen without distinction of age and sex: Ex. $20^{24}$; 1 Sam. $15^{21}$; 2 Sam. $24^{22-25}$; 1 Ki. $1^9$.

(*b*) שור the individual animal of this class, *the ox*: 1 Sam. $14^{34}$; 2 Sam. $6^{13}$; 1 Ki. $1^{19-25}$. In Hos. $12^{12}$ [E.V.$^{11}$] the text is very doubtful.

(*c*) עגל fem. עגלה *the calf*, though the term was applicable also to older animals than is covered by the English term, and is applied in Gen. $15^9$ to a three-year-old. For the masc. see Mic. $6^6$; for the fem. Gen. $15^9$ (cp. העגל Jer. $34^{18 f.}$); 1 Sam. $16^2$.

(*d*) בני בקר (1 Sam. $14^{32}$) also denotes younger animals of the herd, though the phrase was applicable to פרים (*e*) see e.g. Nu. $28^{11}$; Ex. $29^1$.

(*e*) פר *the bull*: Ex. $24^5$; Jud. $6^{25 f.}$; 1 Sam. $1^{24 f.}$; 1 Ki. $18^{23-3 f.}$.

(*f*) פרה *the cow*: 1 Sam. $6^{14}$.

2. Sheep.

(*a*) The collective term צאן which includes goats: Ex. $20^{24}$; 1 Sam. $15^{21}$; 1 Ki. $1^{9, 19, 25}$,

(*b*) שה the individual animal—whether sheep or goat: Gen. $22^{7 f.}$; 1 Sam. $14^{34}$ (in Gen. $22^{7 f.}$ E.V. very misleadingly renders 'lamb').

(*c*) טלה חלב *the sucking lamb*: 1 Sam. $7^9$; cp. the firstlings of the flock (בכרת צאנו: Gen. $4^4$) which would normally be offered young.

(*d*) The terms כבש, כבשה, כשב, כשבה, which were used with great frequency in P, refer to sheep generally, or in some cases more specifically, to rams or ewes older than the טלה, younger than the איל (*e*), or say above one and under three years of age. There is no certain instance of this term connected with sacrificial custom

in pre-exilic literature; for though כשבים are mentioned in Is. $1^{11}$ (MT), the term is absent from LXX. Still, if in early times all slaughter of domestic animals was sacrificial, then the ewe (כשבה) of 2 Sam. $12^{4-6}$ was sacrificed, though this particular ewe, indeed, which is described as young or small (קטנה), may have been no older than a טלה (*c*). But the absence of these terms in the pre-exilic allusions to sacrifice must be accidental; the ewe and the male sheep older than a טלא younger than an איל must have frequently been offered in early, as they certainly were in later, times.

(*e*) איל *the* (full-grown) *ram* (cp. under (*d*)): Gen. $22^{13}$; 1 Sam. $15^{22}$; Is. $1^{11}$; Mic. $6^{7}$.

3. Goats.

(*a*) and (*b*) as under (2).

(*c*) גדי *the kid*: Jud. $13^{15, 19}$ (cp. $6^{19}$), 1 Sam. $10^{3}$.

(*d*) עז *the goat*: and in Gen. $15^{9}$ the *female* goat.

(*e*) עתוד *the he-goat*: Is. $1^{11}$.

4. Doves.

The term used in Gen. $15^{9}$, as later in P, is תר with the addition of 'and a young bird' (גוזל). The term used in Is. $60^{8}$ which is generally relied on as showing that doves were domesticated in Is. $60^{8}$ is יונה. In Ps. $74^{19}$ to which Nowack (p. 210, n. 1) appeals, the text is none too certain. On the other hand, Jer. $8^{7}$, Cant. $2^{12}$, do not disprove domestication, but merely prove that wild doves were well known.

In addition to the foregoing explicit terms, we find frequent reference (2 Sam. $6^{13}$; 1 Ki. $1^{9, 19, 25}$; Am. $5^{22}$; Is. $1^{11}$) to the sacrifice of מריא *the fatling*, or as some think (e.g. Ges. B., s.v.) the fatted *calf*.

No safe conclusion can be drawn from the foregoing references as to any special preference for either sex or any age; the normal burnt offering was not, as the erroneous translation of שה by 'lamb' in R.V. of Gen. $22^{7, 8}$ might suggest, 'a lamb'; on the other hand it is significant for the freedom of choice left in this matter that the term used in Isaac's question is one that is indifferent as between sheep and goats, and as to age or sex:[1] what Isaac asks is 'Where is the animal from the flock for a burnt-offering', and Abraham replies 'God will provide the animal from the flock for the burnt-offering.' The term refers to any sheep and

[1] Later law (Lev. $1^{3, 10}$; cp. $3^{1, 6}$) required a *male* for a *burnt offering*: early practice allowed also *females* (1 Sam. $6^{14}$).

goat, but not to oxen: from which we may perhaps infer that a sheep[1] or a goat was more frequently sacrificed than an ox: or at least we may find in this passage a check on any tendency to infer from the slightly more frequent references to sacrifices of animals of the bovine kind that these were actually more frequent.

In addition to the general inference as to age indicated by the variety of terms used, a few specific statements can be cited: yearlings of all three kinds—oxen, sheep, goats, which are frequently mentioned in P were probably enough, before the Exile, also frequently sacrificial victims, though the only actual reference to them is Mic. $6^6$, which speaks of 'male calves of a year old' as burnt-offerings. The milch kine (פרות עלות)[2] of 1 Sam. $6^{10, 14}$ would be at least somewhat older. 1 Sam. $1^{24}$ LXX[3] refers to a three-year-old bull, and Gen. $15^9$ refers to a three-year-old cow (עגלה), a three-year-old female goat, and a three-year-old ram. In spite of some obvious corruption in the present text, Jud. $6^{25}$ may have referred to a seven-year-old cow.[4] Later law required that all animals for sacrifice must be at least eight days old (Lev. $22^{27}$), and so far as firstlings are concerned this requirement was ancient (Ex. $22^{29}$ [E.V.$^{30}$]). Under the Deuteronomic law (Dt. $15^{19f.}$) it is probable that the firstlings were actually sacrificed within a few weeks of birth (cf. Dr. on Ex. $22^{29}$ [E.V.$^{30}$]).

[1] The sacrificial animal *par excellence* among the Babylonians: Jastrow, i. 838, n. 2; cp. p. 446.

[2] It is barely possible that another reference to milch kine once stood in Mic. $6^6$: עולות was doubtless originally, as still often elsewhere in MT, written עלות, which can be pointed עֲלוֹת: this occurs absolutely of milch animals in Ps. $78^{71}$, Is. $40^{11}$—in the last passage parallel to טלאים as then it would be parallel to עגלים—but עגלים בני שנה.

[3] Μόσχῳ *τριετίζοντι* = פַּר מְשֻׁלָּשׁ, which is generally and rightly preferred to פרים שלשה; see Dr., ad loc.

[4] On Greek offerings of yearlings, two year-olds, three-year-olds, five-year-olds and Latin offerings of *bidentes*, see Dillmann, *Leviticus*, p. 575.

# APPENDIX II

## SELECTIONS FROM SABAEAN INSCRIPTIONS,

ILLUSTRATING p. 63.

(i) Haram, son of Tauban, dedicated and vowed (this tablet) to Du Samawi because he had approached a woman during her sacred (or closed) period, and had fondled a woman during menstruation, and had intercourse with a woman in childbed, and had had intercourse being himself unclean, and had remained in his clothes unchanged; and because he had touched menstruous women and had not washed, and had spilled semen on his clothes. Then he humbled and afflicted himself and paid a quittance (or thrown himself on the ground). May God reward him. G.I. 1052, D.H.M. Wiener Hof Museum, No. 6.

(ii) Amat-Abiha dedicated and vowed this to Du Samawi, Lord of Bin, because she had approached a man on the third day of the feast, being menstruous at the time, and he departed without washing himself, and she sought a man while .... G.I. 1054.

(iii) *D.* Aḥiyyat (𐩣𐩺𐩲𐩵), daughter of Thauban, a woman[2] of (𐩺𐩣𐩺𐩵𐩱) dedicated and vowed, (𐩺)𐩨𐩺𐩣𐩧|𐩣𐩺𐩱𐩺𐩣) (Hommel: hat ein dankopfer und Gelübde dargebracht) (this bronze tablet) to[3] Du-Samawi in Bin, because she had [4]sinned (𐩣𐩵𐩥𐩺𐩱) in their house sanc[5]tuary, and because she had gone out [6]to the place (𐩺𐩺𐩥𐩧𐩨|𐩺𐩨𐩣) being un[7]clean, and because she had sinned (𐩣𐩵𐩥𐩺) in the [8]night both wittingly and unwittingly. [9]Then she humbled and afflicted herself and ?[10] cast herself on the ground (so D. H. M., Hommel: paid a quittance (Zahlen), M. A. Levy: she will be thankful (𐩺𐩵𐩱𐩣𐩧). *ZDMG* xxiv. 198–200).

(iv) Murgilat, daughter of Tuḥaiti, [2]dedicated and vowed (this bronze tablet) to the Lord [3]of the house of the god Su'aid, [4]because she sought pardon (𐩧𐩱𐩣)𐩨𐩧𐩣𐩵) of him in order that [5]he might again be appeased, and he then kept far from her (misfortune) (so D. H. M., Hommel: then he appointed a penance for her). Then she had sinned (so D. H. M., Hommel: presented a sin-offering, 𐩣𐩵𐩥𐩺𐩧) and cast herself on the ground (so D. H. M., Hommel: paid a quittance) and humbled and afflicted herself. So now may he reward her with favou (𐩲𐩣𐩲𐩺𐩺|𐩱𐩺𐩥𐩧𐩲𐩱|𐩺𐩧). *ZDMG* xxiv. 195–198.

In l. 6, D. H. M's pluperfect is questionable.

In No. 1 𐩣𐩵𐩥𐩺 introduced by 𐩣𐩨𐩥 is obviously part of the offence, in No. 2 introduced by 𐩧.

Cp. also Lagrange: *Études sur les Réligions Sémitiques*, pp. 144 f., 256 f.

# APPENDIX III

## EXTRACT FROM THE SECTION OF THE MEGILLATH TA'ANITH DEALING WITH THE MONTH ADAR.[1]

(See pp. 279 ff.)

### XII.

(*a*) The 8th and 9th of Adar they supplicated and sounded blasts for rain.

If they blow on the first, why also on the second? Because the first is for this year, the second for next year. When the word *first* is used in this tract, it does not always mean *first of the month*, nor does *second* mean *second* of the month, nor *third* mean *third of the month*, but they use the phrase to mean *first month* and all that is involved therein.

(*b*) On the 12th thereof is the day of Tyrian.

This commemorates his seizure of Lulianas and his brother Pappus at Ludicia. He said, 'Are you of the family of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah? Then let your God deliver you out of my hands, as He delivered Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah out of the hand of Nebuchadnezzar.' They answered, 'Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah were just and upright, and king Nebuchadnezzar was fit and worthy that a miracle should be wrought in this case. But thou, O king, art wicked and art not worthy that a miracle should be wrought in thy case, and we are worthy of death. And if thou slay us not, the Lord has many slayers, many bears, many lions, many serpents, many scorpions, which will attack us. And if thou slay us, God will require our blood at thy hands.' Men say that they did not depart thence till there came Roman Prefects and crushed his skull with rods and staves.

(*c*) On the 13th thereof is the day of Nicanor.

Men say that Nicanor was one of the Prefects of the Greek kings who had succeeded Alexander. Day by day he raised his hand against Jerusalem and against the holy edifice, and reproached, blasphemed, and reviled, and said, 'When will they fall into my hands, that I may tear down this fortress?' And when the Hasmonean house won the kingdom and conquered them, they gathered together against his forces. And they slew till they reached those that were near him, and struck off their heads and cut off their thumbs and great toes. And they struck off his head and cut off his thumbs and great toes, and hanged him before Jerusalem. And they wrote below, 'Thus should vengeance be taken of the mouth that spake proudly and of the hands that were raised against Judah and Jerusalem and the Holy Place'. And the day on which they did thus they appointed as a festal day.[2]

[1] The sections in large type represent the Aramaic text, the small type the Hebrew commentary.

[2] Hebrew here and elsewhere יום טוב.

(*d*) On the 14th and 15th thereof (are the days of) Purim. No mourning.

These are the days on which miracles were wrought for Israel in the case of Mordecai and Esther, and they appointed them as festal days. Rabbi Joshua b. Ḳarḥa said, 'From the day when Moses died there hath arisen no prophet which gave new commandments unto Israel, save only the commandment of Purim. Only whereas the deliverance from Egypt is observed seven days, the deliverance of Mordecai and Esther is observed but one day.'

Again. Why is the deliverance from Egypt binding only upon males, whereas the deliverance of Mordecai and Esther is binding upon males and females, young and old, little ones and women, for one day? How much more ought we to make them festal days in every year?

(*e*) On the 16th thereof was begun the building of the wall of Jerusalem. No mourning.

For the Gentiles had destroyed it, and they appointed the day on which they began to build it as a festal day. For it was a joyful thing in the sight of the Lord that Jerusalem should be built, for it is said, 'Thus saith the Lord, I will return unto Zion, and I will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called the City of Truth, and the mountain of the Lord of Hosts, the Mountain of Holiness'. 'Therefore thus saith the Lord, I will return to Jerusalem in compassion, my house shall be built therein, &c.' 'I have stirred him up in righteousness, and all his ways will I direct; he shall build my city and my captives shall be sent forth, without price and without reward, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

(*f*) On the 17th thereof the Gentiles arose against the refugees of Sepphoris in the province of Chalcis and in Beth Zabdain; but there came salvation to the Jews.

For when king Jannaeus came to slay the wise, they fled before him and got them into Syria and dwelt in the province of Chalcis. And the Gentiles who were in that place gathered together against them and shut them in to slay them, and cast great terror upon them, and smote them very heavily. And there were left fugitives among them and they came to Beth Zabdain, and remained there till it was dark and then fled thence. R. Judah said, 'They had a horse harnessed in the gate, and every one of the soldiers who saw it thought that there was no Jew there. And so they remained till it was dark and then fled. And the day on which they fled thence they appointed as a fast.' R. Ḥidḳa said, 'The day on which the Gentiles sought to slay the wise of Israel, the sea rose on high and destroyed a third part of the habitable earth'.

(*g*) On the 20th thereof the people fasted for rain (and it descended).

For there was famine and scarcity in the land of Israel for three successive years, and they prayed, but no rain fell. But when they saw that a great part of Adar had passed and no rain had come, they got them to the

Ḥoni Hamma'gel, and said to him, 'Pray that the rain may descend'. He said unto them, 'Go forth and collect the cooked meats of the passover, that they may not perish'. Then he prayed, but no rain descended. He made a circle and stood in the midst as Habakkuk the prophet had done, as it is said, 'I will stand upon my watch'. He said, 'Master, who art over all the world, thy children have turned their face toward me, for I am as a son of the house before thee. I swear by thy great name that I will not go forth hence till thou have mercy on thy children.' Then rain began to descend drop by drop. They said to him, 'Master of eternity, we have seen thee, let us not die. We believe that these drops of rain came but to absolve thee from thine oath.' He said to them, 'My children, ye shall not die'. He said, 'O Master of the world, not thus have I asked for rain, but for rain to fill wells, cisterns, and caves'. Then began such rain to descend that it would fill the house, and the wise thought that each drop was one *log*. They said to him, 'We have seen thee, let us not die; we think that this rain came but that it should destroy the whole world'. He said unto them, 'My children, ye shall not die'. He said, 'O Master of the world, not thus did I ask, but pleasant rain, a blessing and a kindness'. The rain descended abundantly till Israel went up from Jerusalem to the mountain of the House for the greatness of the rain. They said to him, 'As thou didst pray concerning it that it should descend, so pray that it should not descend and that it should be gone'. He said to them, 'Men pray not because of the abundance of rain, but go and bring me an ox as a thank-offering'. And they brought him an ox as a thank-offering, he laid both his hands upon it and prayed and said, 'Master of the world, see thy people Israel and thy inheritance which thou broughtest forth with thy great strength and thy outstretched arm, which are not able to stand either in the greatness of thy wrath or in the greatness of thy favour. Thou wast wrath with them and they could not stand; thou hast abundantly poured out thy goodness upon them and they cannot stand. May it be pleasing in thy sight that there should be a wind!' At once the wind blew and the clouds were scattered and the sun arose and the ground was dried, and all went out into the field and beheld the desert, that it was full of toadstools and mushrooms. Simon b. Shetaḥ sent to him saying, 'If thou wert not Ḥoni Hamma'gel, my excommunication would be upon thee. Had not thy days been as the days of Elijah the prophet, would not the name of Heaven have been profaned by thee? But what can I do to thee? When thou makest thyself a sinner before the Lord, it is as a son who makes himself a sinner before his father, and doeth his will. He saith to him, "Bring me something warm", and he bringeth it to him; "Bring me something cold", and he bringeth it to him; "Give me nuts"—he giveth to him; "Give me pomegranates"—he giveth to him; "Give me citrons"—he giveth to him. Concerning thee it is written, "Thy father rejoiceth and thy mother, and she that bare thee exulteth".' And that day they appointed as a festal day for that the rain came not down save in accordance with the purity of Israel, as it is said, 'The Lord will open unto thee His good treasure'—*to thee* because of thy purity, and on *thee* doth the matter hang. And he saith, 'In thee

shall all the families of the ground bless themselves, and in thy seed'. *In thee* because of thy purity the rains descend, and the dews descend because of thy purity. And he saith, 'I will give the rains in their season'.

Also they fasted in the days of Samuel the Less, and the rains descended before the sprouting of the leaves. When the people waited, saying, 'It is the profit of the congregation', he said to them, 'I will tell you what this is like. It is like a servant which seeketh a reward from his master'. He saith to them, 'Give ye to him, and let me not hear his voice again'. Samuel the Less appointed another fast and the rains descended after sunset. When men thought, 'It is their profit', he said to them, 'See, ye are like to a king which was wrath with his son and said unto his steward, "Give him not his daily bread till he weep and make supplication before me"'.

(*h*) On the 28th thereof the glad tidings reached the Jews that they were not to be restrained from the study of the Law. No mourning.

For the kings of the Greeks had determined against Israel that they should not study the Law, and that they should not circumcise their sons, and that they should not keep the Sabbath, and that they should worship idols—and the covenant made with Israel was that the Law should not depart from their midst. For it is said, 'It shall not be forgotten from the mouth of his seed'. And it saith, 'If these statutes depart from before me', and, 'This covenant will I, &c.' What did Judah b. Shammah and his companions? They arose and went unto a certain matron to whom all the great ones of Rome used to resort, and they took counsel of her. She said unto them, 'Go and cry aloud by night'. They arose and cried aloud by night, 'O heaven! are we not your brothers? are we not sons of one father, are we not sons of one mother? Why then are we different from all nations and tongues, that you should issue a harsh decree against us?' And they left not that place till they had received permission to observe the three commandments—to circumcise their sons, to study the Law, and to keep the Sabbath—and that they should not worship idols. The day on which they received permission to observe these three commandments, they appointed a festal day.

# INDEXES

## I. GENERAL


Aaron 8, 10, 25, 75, 195, 203 f., 229, 239, 245, 251 f., 262, 308, 316
Aaronic Priesthood 229 ff., 262 ff.
Ab 282 ff., 288, 289, 307, 319, 321
Abel, Sacrifice of, 2 f., 13, 14, 16, 17
Abiathar 218, 229, 232, 257
Abib 276, 297, 343
Abihu 251, 308
Abimelech 90
Abiram 14
Abraham 90, 91 f., 286, 293, 304
Abraham Ibn Ezra 291
Abu-l-Walid 15
Achan 106
Adar 278, 279 f., 281 f., 288, 407 ff.
Adar, the second, 336
Adonijah 120, 125
Agatharcides 186
Age, Hebrew idiom for, 34
Agricultural Festivals 273, 285 ff., 330, 343 f.
Ahaz 137, 138, 139
Ahimelech 218
Ai, King of, 106
Ain Dakkar 107 ff.
Ajlun 109 f.
Akiba 380
Alexander Jannaeus 179, 284
Alignments 102 f.
Alkimus 264
Almsgiving as substitute for Sacrifice 49
Altar 96 ff.
Altar, Heavenly, 131, 146, 148 ff.
Altar, in Ezekiel, 139 f.
Altar, in Priestly Code, 141 ff.
Altar, Maccabaean, 140
Altar, Meaning of Term, 96 ff.
Altar, Natural, 114 ff., 127
Altar of Incense, 98, 142 ff.
Altar of Zerubbabel, 141
Altar, Origin of, 101
Altar, Pre-Israelite, 101 ff.
Altar, Symbolism of, 145 f., 148
Altar-ritual, Types of, 28 ff.
Amaziah, Priest of Bethel, 218
Amman 105, 106
Amos 42, 89, 104, 201
Anathoth 179, 218, 219, 229
Anatolius 342
Ancient Elements in Ritual 312 ff., 315
Animals as Offerings 368 ff., 402 ff.
Anobret 92
Anointing of Priests 258 f.
Anthropomorphism 21 f., 54
Antiochus (Epiphanes) 130, 145, 279, 291
Antoninus Pius 278
Aparche 324
Aphthia 267
Apion 294
Apocalypse, N.T., 131, 157, 159 ff.
Apollo 294
Apotropaic Ritual 363, 384
Arab Methods of Sacrifice 1, 123, 368 ff.
Arabian Blood Ritual 360 ff.
Arak 283
Araunah 131, 132, 136
Archaeological Terms 102 ff.
Aristobulus (king) 179
Aristobulus (philosopher) 342
Ark 119 f., 232
Ark, Heavenly 150
Asaphite Psalms 21
Ass, Redemption of, 24
Astronomical Festivals 285 ff.
Athena 91
Athenian Festivals 332
Atonement 57, 67 ff., 89
Atonement, Day of, 81, 158, 261, 269, 283, 286, 287, 299, 302, 303, 305, 306 ff., 330

Attica 91
Azazel 316 ff.

Baal 45, 87, 115 ff., 128, 183
Babylonian New Year, 303 f.
Babylonian Noah 22
Babylonian Ritual 26 ff., 144
Babylonian Terminology 69 ff.
Babylonian Theory of Heavenly Temple and Altar 150 ff.
Balaam 107, 111
Balak 107
Bamoth 105
Barley (see also Sheaf) 25, 398.
Baruch 314
Bashan 106
Bedawin 110, 253
Beersheba 90, 131, 133, 218
Beit-el-Ghul 110
Beit Jibrin 107
Bel 21
Beloha Arabs 112
Ben Sira 48
Beth Din 269, 327, 328
Beth Ham-midrash 329
Bethany 107, 386
Bethel 90, 103, 126, 133, 218, 229, 230, 399
Bethlehem 400
Bethshemesh 119 f., 125
Birds, Offerings of, 23, 404,
Blood, Expiatory character of, 76 f.
Blood-ritual 30 ff., 313, 315, 352 ff.
Boethusians 327
Booths, Feast of, 272, 276, 279, 286, 289, 293, 294, 295, 299, 306, 310, 401
Bread, Offerings of, 399
Breadalbane 320
Bronze Altar 134, 135 ff., 140 f.
Burnt-offering 6 ff., 23, 30 f., 41 f., 63, 64 ff., 75, 76, 78, 79, 85, 135, 273, 281, 290 f., 351

Cain, Sacrifice of, 2 f., 13, 14, 16, 17
Calendars, Festal, 271 ff.
Calf, Golden, 229.
Camel 14 f., 24, 369, 402 f.
Canaanite Influence on Hebrew Ritual 101
Carthage 27, 28
Celebes 298
Cereal Offerings 23 ff., 65, 273, 398, 399
Cessation of Sacrifice 50, 149, 270, 367, 372, 376 f.
Changes in Altar-ritual 117 ff., 124 ff.
Chanina, R., 327
Chemosh 86 f., 183
Children, Sacrifice of, 86 ff.
Chinese Theory of correspondence between Heaven and Earth 149
Chisleu 280 f., 289, 295
Chitariah Gossaih 94
Chnub 182
Christmas 293
Classification of Gifts according to Altar-ritual 28 ff.
Commemorative element in Eucharist 395
Commemorative element in Passover 378 f., 385, 395
Commemorative Festivals 279 ff., 307
Communion, Passover as, 369, 381
Commutation of Human Victim 87, 91
Commutation of Sacrifice for Money 24, 33 ff.
Confession on Day of Atonement 313, 316
Continual Offering 6
Corn-spirit 332
Covenant, Book of, 275 f.
Covenant Sacrifice 199 f.
Crete 128
Cromlechs 102 ff.
Crucifixion, Date of, 386 ff.
Cucumbers 25
Cup-marks 110, 113, 121, 123, 129
Cyrus 231

Dagon, Priests of, 183
Damascus 138
Dan 131, 198, 199, 209, 216 f., 218, 229, 253, 255
Daniel 21
Date of Crucifixion 386 ff.
Dathan 14
Dating of Festivals 271, 276 ff., 286 ff., 332 ff.
David 14, 22, 45, 83, 130, 131, 134, 156, 214, 226, 235, 240, 314, 347
David, City of, 132
Deborah 184
Dedication, Festival of, 289 f., 304
Dedication of Maccabaean Altar 280
Dedication of the Temple 23
Deuteronomy and the Priesthood 227 ff.
Deuteronomy, Attitude of, toward Sacrifice, 45 f.
Diaspora 319
Differentia of Hebrew Sacrifice 25 ff.
Dimensions of Altar 139 f.

Dolmens 102 ff.
Door-rituals 359 ff.
Dora 294
Doves 23, 344, 404
Dress of Priests 259 f.
Drink-offering 6, 273, 401 f.
Dyaks 298

E-anna 151
Earth and Heaven, Correspondence between, 149 ff.
Easter 323
Echa Rabbati 289
Education 221 ff.
Eglon 16
Egyptian Priests, Hebrew term for, 183
E-khi-li-anna 151
E-kur 152, 160
Eleazar (son of Aaron) 229, 262
Eleazar b. Ananiah 278
Elephantine 39, 130, 144, 182
Eli 85, 93, 198, 209, 232, 253
Elijah 43
Elim 186
El-Mareighat 109
El-Maslubiyeh 109
El-Öla 201, 242 ff.
Elul 280, 300
En Rogel 120
En Soker 327
Enoch, Book of, 318
Ephod 220, 259 f.
Ephraim 245
Epikomion 377 f.
Equinoctial Festivals 289
Equinox, Spring, 341 ff.
Erech 151 f., 187 f.
Esau 16, 71
Eschatological element in Paschal Meal 379 ff., 385, 395 f.
Eschatology 100
Eshmun'azar 185
Eskimos 33
Esther 184
Ethical character of Prophetic Teaching 43 f., 89
Eucharist, Christian ; its relation to Paschal Meal, 392 ff.
Eucharistic Sacrifice 89, 90, 93
Excess at Sacrificial Feasts 93, 375, 381
Exchange of Gifts 33
Exile, Numbers returning from, 215.
Expense of Vows 38 f.
Expiation, Water of, 59
Expiatory Sacrifice only occasional 88
Expiatory value of Sacrifice 53 f., 66, 67 ff., 82 ff., 315
Ezekiel 61, 64 ff., 74, 76, 78, 89, 101, 104, 179, 358 f.
Ezekiel's Altar and Temple 98 ff., 139 f.
Ezekiel's Atonement Ritual 275, 309 ff.
Ezekiel's Festal Calendar 274 f., 287, 289, 301 f.
Ezekiel's View of the Priesthood 99, 226 ff., 240 f., 261 f.
Ezra 215, 235, 310, 315

Falashes 332
Fast on the Day of Atonement 307, 313, 314
Fast, The Great, 289
Fasting as a substitute for Sacrifice 49
Fasting, Roll of, 277 ff., 285, 287 ff., 298, 299, 407 ff.
Feasts 271 ff.
Fedu 361, 368
Fellowship-offering 11
Festal Calendars 271 ff.
'Fill the hand' 249 f.
Fines, Sacrifices as, 37, 58
Fire, Offerings made by, 9, 273
Fire-ritual 30 ff.
Firstborn 24, 33 ff.
Firstfruits 24 ff., 29, 46, 94, 272, 286, 331, 385, 386, 389, 398, 399, 402
Food of God, Sacrifice as, 21 f., 331
Foreign Attendants in Temple 233 ff.
Foundation Sacrifice 87
Freewill Offering 6, 273
Full Moon and Festivals 285 ff., 341

Galilee 107
Galilee, Sea of, 107
Gamaliel, R., 342, 374, 379, 380
Gannoth Seriphim 327
Gebel-el-Maslubiyeh 110
Gehinnom 87 f.
Geliloth 104
Gemara 303
*Gēr* 46
Gerizim, Day of Mt., 280
Gerizim, Mt., 280, 339, 372
Gezer 121, 122
Gezer Calendar 301
Ghuls 110
Gibeonites 233, 235
Gideon 114 ff., 127, 129, 131

Gifts, Sacrifices as, 2 ff., 32 f., 39 f., 41 ff., 51 ff., 56, 92
Gift, use of term in E.V(V)., 4 ff.
Gilead 230
Gilgal 102 ff.
Gog 100
Gossaih 94
Graves, Dolmens at, 112 f.
Gudea 151, 154, 187
Guilt-offering 6, 7, 23, 30, 37, 58, 61 64 ff., 67, 75, 76, 79, 80

Half-shekel Tax 75
Hallel 379, 380
Hammurabi 151
Hannah 93
Hanukkah, Feast of, 279, 280, 291
Harvest, Feast of, 273, 285, 286, 287, 297, 314, 319
Hasidaeans 264
Hasmonaeans 265
Heave-offering 6
Heaven and Earth, Correspondence between, 149 ff.
Heavenly Altar 131, 146, 148 ff.
Heavenly Ark 150
Heavenly Sacrificial Service 148 ff.
Heavenly Sanhedrin 150
Heavenly Temple 150 ff.
Heavenly Temple Plans 153 f.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 31, 52, 53, 319
Hebron 90
Hecataeus 140, 141, 268
Hellenistic influence on Passover Ritual 374 f., 377
Herbs 25
Hereditary Priesthood 262 ff.
*Herem* 23
Hermas 168
Herod 265, 307
Herod, Temple of, 132, 140, 141
Heshbon, Dolmens at, 111
Hierocracy 211
High Places, Priests of, 217
High Priest 256 ff., 312 f., 317
High Priest, Appointed by foreign Governments, 264 f.
High Priest, Election of, 266 f.
High Priest, Qualifications of, 265 ff.
High Priests, Families of, 266 ff.
Hilkiah 257
Hillel 292, 300, 380
Hinnom, Valley of the Son of, 87
Historical Origin of Festivals 279 ff., 285
Holocaust 7
Holy of Holies 133, 145
Holy Place 144, 145
Honey 25 ff., 402
Horns, Day of Blowing of, 272, 304
Horses 24
Hosea 42, 104, 222, 223
Huldah 184
Human Sacrifice 35, 43, 86 ff.
Human Share in Sacrificial Gifts 22, 29 f., 34
Hymns in Paschal Meal 377 ff.

Idumaeans 294
Incense, Altar of, 98, 142 ff.
Incense, Symbolism of, 145 f.
Infant Sacrifice 86 ff.
Ingathering, Feast of, 276, 285, 286, 289, 297 f., 301, 305
Installation of Levites 249 f.
Intercalation 335, 342 f.
Isaac, Birth of, 286, 299
Isaac, Sacrifice of, 35, 49, 91 f., 299
Isaac, Theophany to, 90
Isaiah 14, 42, 43, 89, 93, 201
Isaiah's Wife 184
Ishmael, R., 327
Ishtar, Temple and Priestesses of, 187
Ithamar 229
Iyyar 280 f.

Jacob 16, 71, 90, 94, 103, 106, 124, 286, 307 f.
Jamleh 109
Jason 263 f.
Jaulan 107
Jebusite Altar 132 f.
Jehoash 61
Jehoiada 257, 314
Jehoshaphat 237
Jehozedek 230
Jehuda, R., 312, 328
Jephthah 36, 92 f.
Jeremiah 41, 87, 89, 179, 218
Jericho 104
Jeroboam 240, 251, 298
Jeruel 91
Jerusalem, Altars at, 130 ff.
Jerusalem, Fall of, 50
Jerusalem, Priests of, 218 f., 223, 255
Jerusalem Temple, Origin of, 84 f., 90
Jesus Christ, the True Passover, 396 ff.
Jethro 198 f., 204, 206 ff.
Jewellery, Offering of, 23
Jisr-er-Rukkad 108

Jinn 360, 361, 363, 365
Job 85 f., 91
Johanan b. Zakkai 45, 51, 53, 294, 303, 328
Johannine Date for Crucifixion 386 ff.
John Hyrcanus 179, 265, 280
Jonathan Maccabaeus 265
Jonathan, Priest of Dan, 199, 253
Jordan 103, 104
Jose, R., 278, 375
Joseph 308
Joseph, Tribe of, 241
Joseph of Arimathea 389
Josephus 96, 140, 142, 152, 323, 332, 381
Joshua (Priest) 230, 262, 264
Joshua, R., 53, 299
Joshua, Son of Nun, 262
Josiah 107, 130, 237, 371
Jotham 22
Jubilee, Year of, 300, 302
Jubilees, Book of, 157 ff., 286, 304, 381
Judas Maccabaeus 265, 280, 291
Judgement at New Year 303 ff.

Kadesh 255
Kadesh, Priesthood of, 209
Kathartic value of Passover 384
Kâtib 123
Ḳᵉdeshoth 187, 235
Kerak 360
Kid as Passover Victim 344 ff.
Ḳiddush 394
Ḳidron 132
Ḳimḥi 15
Kingship, Pre-exilic, 256
Korah 14, 251
Koran 13, 58
Ḳorban 13. 18, 51, 354, 384
Kosarane 94
Kronos 91
Kull Gossaih 94
Kurbit Hamatah 109
Kurdish Blood-ritual 361

Laban 106
Lamb, Meaning of term in E.V(V)., 345, 404
'Lamb', Paschal, 344 ff.
Laish 216
Lattu 283
Lawi'a 186, 243 ff.
Leah 243
Leaven, Taboo on, 23, 26, 385 f.
Leavened Bread presented at the Sanctuary 23, 26, 399
Leontopolis 130, 264
Leper, Ritual for cleansed, 19, 38
Leprosy 221
Leprous House, Ritual for cleansing, 75
Levi 186
Levites 46, 75, 99, 181, 213 ff., 226 ff., 239 ff., 268
Levites, a Profession, 240, 245 ff.
Levites, Numbers of, 213 ff.
Levites, Ritual of Presentation, 59
Levitical Priesthood 216 ff., 225 ff., 239 ff.
Life-long Priesthood 262 ff.
Lights, Feast of, 290 ff.
Little (Second) Passover 282, 288, 354
Lot in election of High Priests 266 f.
Lulab 293 f.
Lunar influence on Calendar 285 ff.
Luz 103
Lysimachus 264

Ma'an 368
Maccabees, Altar of, 140, 141
Maccabees, Priesthood of, 179
Malays 298
Mamzer 268 f.
Manasseh 115
Mandaeans 304
Manslaughter, Expiation of, 75
Manoah 114 f., 127, 131
Ma'on 169
Marduk 152, 303
Marmita 121
Maṣṣebah 96, 102 f., 123 ff., 128
Maṣṣoth 271 f., 279
Materials of Sacrifice 21 ff., 398 ff.
Mattathias 130
Meal-offering 76, 79, 80, 135, 281, 399
Mecca 15
Medical Duties of Priests 221 f.
Megiddo 121, 122, 128, 132
Mᵉgillath Ta'anith 277 ff., 287 ff., 307, 407 ff.
Meir, R., 328
Melchizedek 182
Melons 25
Menelaus 263 f.
Menhir 102 f.
Meribah 255
Micah 216, 220, 240
Micah (Prophet) 42 f.
Michael, Sacrifice of, 169, 173
Midian 208, 253
Midianite War 23, 75

Minaean Inscriptions 15, 63 f., 75, 242 ff., 406
Miriam 189, 203 f., 251
Mirth at Sacrifice 93 ff.
Mishnah 9, 25, 26, 28, 29, 38 f., 140, 141, 142, 237, 266, 268 f., 398
Mizpah 90, 133, 400
Moab, Dolmens in, 111 f.
Moab, Human Sacrifice in, 86 f.
Modin 130
Mohammedan Calendar 289, 296
Moloch 87, 88
Molten Sea 152
Money Payments 35 ff., 58 f., 61
Money Value of Sacrifice 37 ff., 52
Moral Demands of Yahweh 44 ff.
Moriah, Mt., 132
Moses and the Tabernacle 155, 156
Moses as King 180
Moses as Priest 180, 194 ff., 239, 241
Moses as Prophet 180, 203 f.
Moses, Blessing of, 245, 254 f.
Mosque of Omar 121, 132
Mugilat 63
Munahir 110
Murder, Expiation of, where Murderer is unknown, 31
Musaph 292

Nabataean Inscriptions 15
Nabi Elisha 123
Nadab 251, 308
Nana 27, 151
Nathin 268
Nazirite 38 f.
Nebo 27
Nebuchadrezzar 27, 139
Nehemiah 236, 280
Nethinim 234 ff., 255
New Moon 274, 277, 279, 285
New Year's Day 285 ff., 299 ff., 319
Nicanor 279
Nina 154
Nindub 154
Ningiran 154
Nisan 272 f., 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 286, 299, 300, 302, 303, 324, 325, 331 ff., 337 ff., 385 ff.
Noah 22, 84, 349
Nob 218, 399
Nocturnal character of Passover 336, 340 f.
Nomadic Festivals 343 f.

Oats 328
Oblation, Use of term in E.V(V)., 4 f., 18
Obligatory Gifts 23
Offering, Use of term in E.V(V)., 4 f.
Og 106
Oil, Offerings of, 25, 399 f.
Omar, Mosque of, 121, 132
Omer, Counting of, 323
Onias II 264
Onias III 130, 262 ff.
Onions 25
Ophrah 90, 115 ff., 130, 132, 133
Oracle-givers, Women as, 188
Ouranos 91

Parched Corn, Offerings of, 399
Paschal Meal 367 ff.
Paschal Victim 323, 337 ff.
Passover 271 f., 277, 282, 285 f., 288, 289, 300, 302, 303, 306, 323, 330, 332, 334, 335, 337 ff.
Passover in relation to Firstfruits 343 f.
Patriarchal Altars 129
Paul 38
Pauline date for Crucifixion 386, 388 f.
Payment, Sacrifice as, 7
Peace-offering 5 ff., 23, 29, 41, 42, 44, 64 ff., 75, 76, 79, 80, 85, 135, 136, 291, 351
Pentecost 272, 279, 286, 303, 323, 328, 334, 336
Petra, Altar of, 122
Pharisees 281, 326, 334
Philistine Priests, Hebrew term for, 183
Philistines and the Ark 37, 62 f., 119 f.
Philo 52, 65, 96, 142, 146, 152, 174 f., 205, 286, 323, 332, 341, 378, 381
Phineas 75, 229
Phineas b. Samuel 267
Phoenician Cultus, Women in, 184 f., 192
Phoenician Myth 91 f.
Phoinikon 186
Phrygian Inscriptions 63
Pigeons 23, 344
Pilgrimage Feasts 276
Pillar 96
Pleiades 298, 333
Polychrome Bible 271
Pomegranates 25
Pompey 307
Population of Palestine 213 f., 225 f.

Porters 234, 235, 255
Prayer as necessary accompaniment of Sacrifice 86
Prayer as substitute for Sacrifice 147, 177, 277
Prayer in Passover 378
Prayer symbolized by Incense 145 f.
Pre-exilic theory of Sacrifice 88 ff., 95
Presence, Table of, 129
Priest Code, Altar in, 140 ff.
Priest Code, Atonement in, 73 ff.
Priest Code, Historical value of, 212, 225
Priest Code, Priesthood in, 241
Priestesses 184 ff., 204
Priesthood, Aaronic, 228 ff., 239, 251
Priesthood in Deuteronomy 227 f., 240
Priesthood in Ezekiel 99, 226 f., 228 ff., 240, 261 f.
Priesthood, Levitical, 226, 239 ff.
Priesthood, Lifelong Tenure of, 262
Priesthood, Political Status of, 226, 237, 260 ff.
Priesthood, Post-exilic, 225 ff., 256 ff.
Priesthood, Terminology of, 181 ff.
Priests 179 ff.
Priests and High Places 217
Priests and Kings 211, 256, 260
Priests and Prophets 180, 223 f., 238
Priests as Historians 223
Priests as Teachers 219 ff., 237 f.
Priests, Consecration ritual of, 258 f.
Priests' Duties before the Exile 219 f.
Priests, Foreign, 182 ff., 233 ff.
Priests, Medical Duties of, 221 f.
Priests, Non-Levitical, 239 ff., 253 f.
Priests' Share in Sacrifices 8, 10, 22, 25, 26, 28 ff., 34 ff., 47, 61, 65 f., 331
Prince, Ezekiel's view of, 261
Princes' Offering 23
Proerosia 332
Prophetic Attitude to Sacrifice 41 ff., 88, 89 f.
Propitiatory Value of Sacrifice 53 f., 55 ff., 67 ff., 82 ff.
Proselytes 268
Prostitutes, Temple, 187
Public and Private Sacrifices 39 f.
Purim, Feast of, 279, 280, 284, 288

Quails 338
Quantities prescribed for Sacrifice 135, 273
Qubur Bene Israil 110

Rajamahall, Harvest Rites at, 94
Ramah 93, 132
Range of Hebrew Sacred Gifts 22, 398 ff.
Rechabites 374
Red Cow, Ritual of the, 31, 59 f.
Redemption of Firstborn 24, 34 ff.
Reformation of Josiah, its effect on Paschal Ritual 371 ff.
Religion as Fellowship with God 44
Remembrance, Day of, 272 f.
Repentance the true Sacrifice 50
Resh Lakish 169
Revelry at Sacrifice 93
Ritual of Firstfruits 94
Rock surfaces as Altars 102 ff.
Romans 281
Rosh Hash-shanah 300
Rujm el-Kheleif 109
Rye 328

Sabaean Inscriptions 15, 63, 242 ff., 406
Sabbath 271, 302, 313 f., 326
Sabbath, Heavenly, 157
Sabbath, Lights kindled for, 295
Sabbath, Offerings proper to, 273 f., 302
Sacra 8, 23
Sacrifice as Commemoration 47 f., 94
Sacrifice as Communion 1 f., 54, 369 f.
Sacrifice as the Eating of the God 369 f.
Sacrifice as Fine 37, 38 f.
Sacrifice as Food of God 21 f., 32
Sacrifice as Gift 2 ff., 32 ff., 39 f., 56, 92, 352
Sacrifice as Rejoicing 47, 93, 94, 95
Sacrifice as Thanksgiving (Eucharistic) 46 ff., 89, 93, 94, 95
Sacrifice, Divine Ordinance of, 51, 81
Sacrifice, Effect of Cessation of, 50, 149 f., 367, 372, 376 f.
Sacrifice, Expiatory and Propitiatory Value of, 53 f., 55 ff., 67 ff., 82 ff.
Sacrifice, Foundation, 87
Sacrifice, Futility of, 41 ff.
Sacrifice, Heavenly, 150 ff.
Sacrifice, Human, 86 ff.
Sacrifice, Materials of, 21 ff., 398 ff.
Sacrifice, Original Mode of, 117
Sacrifice, Possible Modern Restoration of, 146 f.

Sacrifice, Terminology of, 3 ff., 56 ff., 66, 67 ff., 181, 401 f.
Sacrifice, use of term in E.V(V)., 5 ff.
Sacrifice, its value determined by character of offerer, 48 f.
Sadducees 230, 281, 326, 332
Samaritan Ritual 296, 338, 340, 341, 347, 351, 367, 372, 373, 374
Samaritan Schism 230
Samuel 85, 93, 104, 132, 218, 253
Sana' 242
Sanchuniathon 91
Sanhedrin, Heavenly, 150
Saracen Sacrifice 368, 370
Sarawak 298
Sargon 217
Satan 318, 319
Sattûku 27
Saul 17, 83, 93, 104, 114, 119, 125, 127, 134, 220, 370
Scape-goat 313, 315 ff.
Scribes 238
Se'irim 318
Self-surrender as Sacrifice 50, 54
Seraiah 230
Shammai 278, 292, 295, 300, 380
Sheaf (Firstfruits) 272, 323 ff., 385, 386
Sheaf, its relation to Passover, 343 f.
Sheba, Queen of, 184
Shebat 281, 300
Shechem 90, 115, 120, 218, 230, 339
Shechemites 245
Sheikh as Priest 222 f.
Sheikh Muflet 112
Shekinah 161
Sheol 162
Shesheth, R., 49
Shewbread 9 f., 27
Shewbread, Table of, 98 f., 101, 134
Shiloh 209, 218, 223, 253, 255
Shim'on, R., 300
Shunamite 314
Sifre 52, 81
Silver Vessels, Offerings of, 23
Simeon b. Azzai 51, 81
Simeon b. Gamaliel 283
Simeon, Tribe of, 245, 246
Simon I (Priest) 262
Simon Maccabaeus 265
Simon the Cyrenian 390
Sin-offering 6, 7, 23, 30, 37, 57 f., 61, 63, 64 ff., 67, 75, 76, 79, 80, 82, 95, 292, 306, 307, 351, 366
Sinai 155, 299
Sinaitic Inscriptions 186
Singers, Temple, 188 ff., 234 f., 255
Sippar, Temple of, 151
Sira, Ben, 48
Sivan 272, 281, 299, 334
Slain-offering 6, 273
Soil, Altars of, 114
Solar influence on Festivals 288 ff.
Solomon 17, 132, 134 ff., 141, 155 f.
Solomon's Servants, Sons of, 234 f.
Solstitial Festivals 289 ff., 298
Soothing Odours 77 f., 83
Sor'ah (Sur'ah) 118, 121, 128, 130, 132
South Arabian Inscriptions 15, 63 f., 242 ff., 406
Spelt 328
Spirituality of Prophetic Religion 4
Stones inhabited by Numina 104, 126, 141
Sublimation of Food by Fire 32
Sun God 128

Ta'anach (Ta'annek) 122
Tabernacle, Point of Revelation, 202
Tabernacles, Feast of, 291, 303
Table 97 ff., 129
Tammuz 281, 283
Tarphon, R. (Trypho), 380
Tax on Firstborn 35 f.
Tekoa 91
Tel-el-Amarna Tablets 184
Tell el-Muntar 109
Tell el-Ḳady 107
Tell Sandeḥannah 107
Tell Ta'annek, 'Altars' of, 143 f.
Temple, Heavenly, 150 ff.
Temple Tax 28
Terminology of Sacrifice 3 ff., 56 ff., 66, 67 ff.
Terumah 331
Thank-offering 5, 7
Thanksgiving, Days of, 314
Tishri 286, 299, 300, 302, 306, 351
Tithe 25, 29, 36 f., 42, 331
Tophet 87
Torres Straits Islanders 298
Trajan 278
Trespass-offering 57 f.
Tribute 16, 17
Trilithon 110, 111
Trumpets, Feast of, 303
Tsil 109
Tyropaean Valley 132

Unclean Animals, Redemption of 34 f.
Unleavened Bread, Feast of, 285 f., 289, 291, 297, 299, 306, 314, 323

324, 325, 334, 337 ff., 384, 385, 390
Unleavened Cakes 26, 374, 399
Unsin 275, 309, 384
Uriah 257
Urim and Thummim 220 f., 237, 254

Vegetable Offerings 3, 8, 25, 28, 398 ff.
Victim identified with God 369
Vines 25
Vineyards, Dancing in, 283 f., 321
Vow 6, 36, 273
Vow, Nazirite, 38 ff.

Wadd 243, 253
Wadi el-Afrit 11
Wailing women 187
Water, Libation of, 400 f.
Water of Sin 59
Wave-offering 6, 26, 27, 330 f.
Weeks, Feast of, 26, 276, 297, 333
Weli 222
Well-doing the only Propitiation 89
Wheat 328, 333, 398
Whitsuntide 323
Wine in Paschal Meal 374 f.
Wine, Offerings of, 400
Women in Cultus 184 ff., 204
Women, Vows made by, 38
Wood, Offering of, 282 ff.
Work, Abstention from, 272, 302, 313 f., 386

Xanthicus 325
Xanthus, Inscription of, 74

Yachin and Boaz 136
Yahweh, Donor of Israel's Possessions, 44 f.
Yahweh, Midianite Origin of, 252 f.
Yahweh, Spirit and not Flesh, 43
Yoma 306 ff.
Yule Log 295

Zabidus 204
Zadok 64, 99, 227, 257
Zadokite Priests 227 ff., 266
Zealots 266 f.
Zebul 169
Zechariah 316
Zechariah b. Kebutal, R., 269
Zerubbabel 132, 141, 230, 262
Zikkurat 152
Zion 84 f., 130 ff.
Zipporah 199
Zodiac 246

## II. AUTHORS CITED

Abrahams 49, 268, 272, 291, 299
Addis 136, 229

Baentsch 127, 346, 356
Barton 126, 144
Baudissin 103, 104, 105, 184
Beer 356, 369, 375, 377, 378, 381, 392
Bellarmine 177
Bennett 180
Benzinger 234, 246, 302, 400
Bertholet 37, 64, 98, 196, 275, 301, 302
Box 223, 393
Budde 131, 133, 401
Burney 71, 136

Carpenter 202, 330
Chapman 26
Charles 156, 157, 162, 168 ff., 354 f.
Cheyne 283, 318
Conder 105 ff.
Cooke 18, 180, 184, 403
Cowley 182
Curtis 156, 214
Curtiss 112, 123, 217, 222, 358, 360, 361

Dalman 278, 281, 296, 343
Davidson 98, 99
Deissmann 12, 74
Delitzsch 27
Dillmann 248, 249, 334, 402, 405
Doughty 360
Driver 37, 69, 98 f., 122, 143, 198, 205, 248, 249, 271, 330, 346, 398, 401, 405

Eerdmans 225, 228, 256 ff., 301 f., 304 f., 310 ff., 335, 336, 356, 357, 364
Eusebius 91, 342
Ewald 296

Frazer 94, 295, 296, 298, 315, 320, 332, 364
Friedländer 306

Graetz 278, 279, 281, 282, 284
Gressmann 106, 111, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 241, 246, 248, 249, 250 ff., 364
Grierson 33
Grimm 290
Grimme 333
Gunkel 91
Guthe 213, 263, 264

Hanauer 121
Haupt 17, 194
Herodotus 144
Hommel 7, 15, 63, 182, 244

Irenaeus 168, 177

Jacob 14
Jacobs 234, 235, 237
Jastrow 151, 152, 154, 186 f., 405
Jaussen 107, 368
Jeremias 26, 149, 151, 152, 154, 189, 402
Justin 347

Kennedy 36, 105
Kennett 229 f.
King 152
Kitchener 107
Kittel 98, 103, 105, 117, 121, 123, 128, 138, 139
König 70 ff., 402
Kosters 230
Kuenen 228

Langdon 27, 71 f.
Levy 342
Lightfoot 173
Lightfoot, S., 289
Lidzbarski 184, 185
Lueken 172

Macalister 107
Mackenzie 105
McNeile 248
Merrill 110
Merx 377, 378
Meyer, Ed., 213, 244, 247, 364
Moffatt 18, 263, 348
Montgomery 338, 351
Moore 119
Müller, D. H., 242 f.
Musil, A., 109, 112

Nilus 123, 368
Nöldeke 183
Nowack 188, 234, 400, 404

Oliphant 107, 109
Oort 229
Orelli 142, 306, 318

Palmer 360
Paterson 9
Peritz 188 f., 191 f.
Petrie 143
Proksch 249

Ramsay 63
Ritschl 69
Rogers 187, 190, 286

Schick 121
Schmoller 69
Schöttgen 172
Schröder 291
Schumacher 108 f., 123
Schürer 37, 140, 142, 145, 262, 307, 342
Schwally 401
Sellin 122, 143
Skinner 16, 136, 246
Smend 275
Smith, G. A., 136, 268
Smith, H. P., 119, 120, 401
Smith, W. R., 1, 27, 29, 69, 135, 136, 359, 368, 401, 402
Spitta 165, 167
Spoer 105, 106, 363
Stade 135, 231, 241, 402

Stanley 338, 340, 351
Steuernagel 241
Stone 394, 395
Surenhusius 303

Theodoret 346
Thomson 340, 351
Toy 64, 100
Tyrwhitt-Drake 107

Van Hoonacker 250, 258
Vincent 107, 110, 112
Vogelstein 229

Wellhausen 69, 123, 136, 183, 228, 234, 256 ff., 336
White 271

Zimmern 69, 181

## III. ARABIC WORDS AND PHRASES

إثم 58
أثام 58
أنس 11
العلى 242
ḍajib 192 f.
ṣâdin 192 f.
غلى 7
fedu 361, 368

kâhin 183 f., 220
kāhinat 186
منع 14 ff.
منحة 14
نسك 401
هدى 15
هديّة 15

## IV. ASSYRIAN WORDS AND PHRASES

apsû 152
âsipu 69
ishtaritum 187
uḫarinnu 189
uḫâti 187
uknû 189
ushu 189
zaḳiḳu 188
zibu 181
ḫarimâti 187
ḫizrêti 187

kemiru 184
kuppuru, kapâru 69 ff.
mushkinu 182
ḳadishtu 187
sattûku 27, 402
ṣit arḫi 301
ṣit šamši 301
rêš šatti 301
su-ba-at 151
teḫû 72

## V. GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES


ἅγια 176
ἄγνισμα 60
ἄζυμα 392, 394
αἶξ 350
ἀμνός 350
ἀνάμνησις 395
ἀπαρασήμαντον 280
ἀρνός 347, 350
ἄρτος 392, 394
ἀρχιερεύς 263 f.
ἀρχιερωσύνη 264

βάλλω 166
βωμός 97

δικαιώματα λατρείας 51, 52
δραγμα 324
δῶρον 17, 18, 19

ἐγκαίνια 290
εἴδωλον 104
εἰρηνικά 7
ἐκχέω 394
ἐνιαύσιος 350
ἐξέρχομαι 166
ἐξιλάσκομαι 74, 359
ἐξιλασμός 359
ἑορτή 278, 282
ἐπίσημον 280
Ἔρ 92
ἔριφος 346 f., 350

θῦμα 347
θύρσος 292
θυσία 12, 17, 347
θυσιαστήριον 97

Ἰεούχ 92
ἱερεῖα 347
ἱερεύς 183
ἱερουργία 175, 353
ἱερόν 175
ἱερὸς λόγος 84, 90, 131, 133
ἱεροσύνη 186

καρπόω 12
κάρπωμα 12
καταγγέλλω 395
κορβᾶν 18

λειτουργέω 158, 190
λειτουργεῖν 176
λύτρον 92

μόσχος 350, 405

νεώς 175
νηστεία 307, 376

ξυλοφορία 282

ὁλοκαύτωμα 12
ὀσμὴ ἀναπαύσεως 81
ὀσμὴ εὐαρεστήσεως 80
ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας 76, 80

παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα 387
πάσχα 390 f.
πέμπω 66
ποίμνιον 346
πρόβατον 346, 350
προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ 263
προσφορά 18

τράγος 350
τράπεζα 100
τριετίζων 405

φρατρίαι 373
φῶτα 296

χαρμοσυνή 278
χειρόκμητον 175

# VI. HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WORDS AND PHRASES


אבן 102
אבן גדולה 102, 103
אדמה 114
אזוב 358
אזכרה 395 f.
איל 403, 404
איש 11, 260
אלמה 325
אנוש 11
אסף 300
אפוד 260
אפיקומין 377 f.
ארא(י)ל 97, 143
ארצה 119
אִשֶּׁה 8 ff., 18, 26, 30, 57
אשם 37, 57 f., 66, 67, 350

ב 104, 131, 249
בוא 17
בזה 100
בין הערבי 337 ff.
בית 260, 309
בכורים 24 ff., 398, 402
במות 217
בן־שנה 348 ff.
בנה 137
בעד 73
בקר 344, 403
ברזל 106, 126
בשורה 58

גדי 350, 404
גוזל 404
גל 102, 106
גלגל 102, 104
גלילה 104
גֻּלָּל 104
גרן 133
דבח 39
דימסונאי 281

הכהן הגדול 257

זבח 5, 6, 7, 34, 41, 120, 181, 354, 372, 400, 401
זכרון 303
זרק 355, 394

חבורה 373
חג 95, 276, 278, 309
חג המצות 399
חג השבעות 333
חטא 309
חטאת 37, 57 f., 59, 66, 67
חמץ 373, 399
חצצרת 303
חרב 126
חרם 23

טלא 404, 405
טלה 350, 403

יבל 17
יום הבכורים 272
יום טוב 281, 407
יום נקנר 280
יום צום 314

מחה 69
מי חטאת 59
מלאכה 272
מלאכת עבדה 272
מנח 14 f.
מנחה 8, 13 ff., 42, 47, 84, 398
מסת נדבת יד 46
מצבה 102 ff.
מצות 392, 399
מקדש 98, 309
מקטרות 97
מריא 404
מררים 374
משמש 266
משפטים 221
מתנת יד 46

נביאה 184
נגש 17, 260
נדבה 7
נוף 331
נחה 15 f.
נחת רוח 81
נסך 400, 401
נפת 27
נשא 17, 260
נתן 18
נתינים 233

עבדה 353, 357
עבר 266
עגל 403, 405
עגלה 403, 405
עולה 5, 6, 7, 12, 118, 405
עון 61
עז 404
על 100, 104, 106

יסוד 355
יצא 276, 300

כבש וגו׳ 403
כפרת 182
כהן, כהנא 181 f., 198
כהנת, כהנתא 184 f.
כהני הבמות 217
כליל 5, 7
כלילאי 281
כמר, כמרא 182 ff.
כסה 68 f.
כסף אשם 37, 61
כסף הכפרים 75
כסף חטאת 37, 61
כפר 57, 67 ff., 85, 309, 359
כרב 17
כריכה 324 f., 329
כשב וגו׳ 403 f.

לבנה 144
לביש 260
לוי 186 ff., 243 ff.
לואה 186
לחם 100, 392, 399
לקח 106, 118, 208
לקט 106
לשכה 29

מבוא 300
מדבת 96
מדין 303
מועד 271, 276, 278, 303
מועדא 279
מזבח 96, 97, 98, 102 ff., 114, 119, 144, 145

עלה 118, 119
עם 120, 131, 133
עם הארץ 269
עמר 272, 325, 330 f.
ערב, ערבים 338
עתור 404

פסח 348
פר 403
פר החטאת 60
פר משלש 405
פרה 403
פרי האדמה 398

צאן 344, 358, 403
צאת השנה 300
צדקה יהוה לך 39
צום רבא 307
צור 102, 103, 118, 119
צורה 154

קדמת 25
קדשים 8, 13, 22 f., 24
קדשות 190
קטנה 404
קטר 26, 143
קמה 399
קרב 17, 18, 26, 208, 354, 355
קרבן 8, 13, 17 ff., 22 ff., 26, 47, 75, 402
קרבנא 13, 19

ראה 155
ראש השנה 301 f.
ראשי 300
ראשית 24 ff., 272, 398, 402
רב כהנים 185
רב כהנת 185
רום 28
ריח ניחח 76 ff., 82 ff.
ריקם 62

שבועת 333
שבת שבתון 314
שדה 118
שה 346 ff., 403
שוב 62
שור 403
שחט 233, 354
שחיטת חלין 9
שחיטת קדשים 9
שלחן 100
שלחן הפנים 98
שלם 5, 7, 41
שם 317
שמן 401
שמרים 341
שפך 400, 401

תבואה 303
תבנית 154, 155
תכונה 154
תלמיד חכם 269
תמידא 281
תנופה 26
תרומה 29
תרועה 303

# VII. BIBLICAL REFERENCES

## (*a*) OLD TESTAMENT


Genesis
4 2
4$^{3-5}$ 398
4$^{5}$ 17
7$^{6}$ 349
7$^{11}$ 349
8$^{13}$ 349
8$^{20}$ *ff.* 84
8$^{20}$ 105
8$^{21}$ 22, 77
12$^{6}$ f. 90
13$^{18}$ 90
14$^{18}$ 197
15$^{9}$ 403, 404, 405
18$^{7}$ 118
22 91, 92
22$^{7}$ f. 403, 404
22$^{9}$ 104
22$^{13}$ 404
26$^{10}$ 57
26$^{22}$ *ff.* 90
28 90, 103, 124 f.
28$^{18}$ 103, 399
28$^{31}$ 124
31 106
31$^{46, 48, 51}$ 106
31$^{54}$ 90, 105
32$^{14-22}$ [E.V. $^{13-21}$] 398
32$^{21}$ [E.V. $^{20}$] 68, 71
34 245 ff.
35$^{6}$ f. 90
35$^{14}$ 399, 400
37$^{7}$ 325
41$^{45, 50}$ 183, 197
46$^{1}$ 400
46$^{20}$ 183, 197
47$^{22}$ 197
47$^{26}$ 183, 197
49 245 f.

Exodus
2$^{16}$ 197
3$^{1}$ 197

Exodus
3$^{2}$ *ff.* 201
3$^{6}$ 201
3$^{12}$ 200
3$^{18}$ 200
4$^{14}$ 245
7$^{1}$ 203
10$^{9}$ 344
12 362
12$^{1-13}$ 357, 367
12$^{1-10(11)}$ 357
12$^{1}$ f. 300
12$^{1b}$ 357
12$^{3-5}$ 345, 348
12$^{3}$ 346 f.
12$^{4}$ 372, 373
12$^{5}$ 348, 350, 358
12$^{6}$ 338, 354
12$^{7}$ 354, 356, 357, 358
12$^{8}$ 354
12$^{9}$ 368
12$^{10}$ 340
12$^{11}$ 354, 357
12$^{12}$ 357
12$^{13}$ 356, 357, 358
12$^{21-28}$ 356, 367
12$^{21}$ f. 356
12$^{21}$ 345, 354, 358
12$^{22}$ 357, 358
12$^{23}$ 358, 362
12$^{24-28}$ 367
12$^{24}$ 353, 355, 357
12$^{25}$ *ff.* 357
12$^{25}$ 353
12$^{26}$ *ff.* 356
12$^{26}$ 353, 378
12$^{27}$ 354, 358, 367
12$^{42}$ 341
12$^{43-49}$ 354, 357
12$^{46}$ 368, 388
12$^{47}$ f. 353
13$^{6, 7}$ 399
13$^{9}$ 378

Exodus
13$^{13}$ 24
13$^{15}$ 34
15$^{20}$ 189
16$^{12}$ f. 338
18 205, 206
18$^{1}$ 197
18$^{13-27}$ 204
18$^{14}$ f. 207
18$^{15}$ f. 204
18$^{18}$ 207
18$^{19}$ f. 207
18$^{24}$ 207
18$^{26}$ 205
19$^{6}$ 197
19$^{22, 24}$ 197
20 116, 123, 139 140, 141
20$^{24-26}$ 114
20$^{24}$ f. 127
20$^{24}$ 104, 403
20$^{25}$ 139
20$^{26}$ 139
21$^{1}$–23$^{19}$ 221
22$^{28}$ *f* [E.V. $^{29}$ f.] 34
22$^{29}$ [E.V. $^{30}$] 398, 405
23 276, 287, 297
23$^{14}$ 95
23$^{14}$ f. 276
23$^{15}$ 276
23$^{16}$ 297, 398
23$^{18}$ 340, 399
23$^{19}$ 398
24$^{4-8}$ 200
24$^{4}$ 105
24$^{5}$ 400, 403
25–27 195
25$^{9}$ 155, 156
25$^{40}$ 155, 156
26$^{30}$ 155
28 f. 195
28$^{1}$ 195
28$^{43}$ 195
29$^{1}$ 403

Exodus
29[2] 399
29[7] 259
29[12] 355, 366
29[18] 78
29[21] 259
29[24 f.] 331
29[25] 79
29[33] 75
29[35 f.] 196
29[40] 399
29[41] 78
30[8] 338
30[15 f.] 75
30[30] 259
32 198
32[25–29] 248 ff.
32[25 ff.] 241
32[29] 198
33 204
33[7–11] 202, 204
33[7 b] 204
34 267, 287, 297
34[18] 276
34[19] 34
34[22 f.] 276
34[22] 297, 333
34[25] 340
35–40 195
38[7] 97
38[8] 190
40[17–29] 281
40[17] 248

Leviticus
1–7 22 ff.
1–3 80
1 79, 344
1[2] 23
1[3 f.] 196
1[3] 23, 351, 404
1[4] 75
1[5] 196, 355, 401
1[9] 78
1[10] 404
1[13] 78
1[14] 23
1[16] 196
1[17] 78
2 75, 76, 399
2[2] 79
2[4] 26
2[9] 79
2[11] 26, 329, 402
2[12] 23, 25, 26, 79, 402

Leviticus
2[14–16] 23, 399
2[14] 328
3 75, 79
3[1] 5, 23, 351, 401, 404
3[5] 79
3[6] 23, 404
3[16] 79
4 f. 351
4 80, 81
4[3] 259
4[4 f.] 196
4[5–7] 196
4[5] 259
4[7] 355, 366
4[8] 60
4[16] 259
4[18] 366
4[23 f.] 23
4[25] 366
4[28 f.] 23
4[30] 366
4[31] 72, 79
4[34] 366
5[7] 344
5[9] 366
5[14–16] 58
5[15 f.] 37
5[16, 18] 58
6[8 [E.V. 15]] 79
6[14 [E.V. 21]] 79
6[15 f. [E.V. 22 f.]] 5
6[15 [E.V. 22]] 259
6[9 [E.V. 26]] 61
7[1 ff.] 26
7[13] 399
7[30] 331
7[35] 9, 10
7[37] 9
8 195, 248
8[12] 259
8[15] 366
8[20 ff.] 196
8[21] 78
8[28] 78
8[29] 196
8[35 f.] 196
9[7 ff.] 196
9[9] 366
10[10 f.] 223
10[1–7] 308
12[8] 344
12[8] 344
13 221
14 316
14[4 f.] 344
14[10 ff.] 399

Leviticus
14[10 f.] 174
14[10] 350
14[20] 75
14[22] 344
14[49 f.] 344
14[53] 75
15[14–29] 344
16 158, 307, 310 ff.
16[1] 308
16[4] 149
16[5] 316
16[7, 8] 316
16[10] 310
16[19] 359
16[20] 316
16[21] 313
16[24] 75
16[32] 73, 259
17[6] 79
17[11] 76
21[10, 12] 259
22[12] 199
22[18 f.] 351
22[27] 405
23 271 ff., 279, 285, 286, 287, 292, 300, 302, 306 ff., 324, 325, 333
23[3] 271 ff.
23[4 ff.] 273
23[4] 271
23[5] 271, 353
23[9–12] 273
23[10–14] 329, 331
23[10] 272, 329, 330
23[11] 329, 330
23[12] 330, 350
23[13] 79, 330
23[14] 329, 330
23[15–20] 273
23[16] 334
23[17] 23, 399
23[18] 78
23[19] 350
23[20] 26, 399
23[22] 273
23[24] 303
23[28, 30 f.] 314
23[29] 307
23[37, 38] 273
23[39–43] 273
23[40–42] 299
23[40] 293
24[7, 9] 9
26 321
26[31] 22, 77

Leviticus
27[1–8] 36
27[11] 4

Numbers
1–4 213
3[6–10] 248
3[5 ff.] 197
3[9] 235
3[10] 195
3[38 ff.] 197
4[3] 349
4[23] 190
5[9] 8
5[26] 331
6 38
6[10] 344
6[12] 350
6[14] 350
7 23
7[16] 350
7[17] 350
7[88] 350
8[5 ff.] 59, 60
8[8] 350
8[11 ff.] 331
8[19] 75, 235
8[24] 190, 349
9[1–13] 353
9[6–14] 282
9[11] 341
9[13] 354
10[10] 303
11[16 f.] 206
12 203, 204
12[6–8] 203
15[3] 12, 79
15[7] 79
15[9 ff.] 344
15[10] 79
15[13] 79
15[14] 79
15[27] 350
16[15] 398
17[11 f.] [E.V. 16[46 f.]] 75
18 ff. 24
18 23, 25, 28
18[2] 248
18[8–32] 22
18[8] 8
18[9] 23
18[12] 25, 28
18[13] 25, 28, 47, 331
18[14] 23
18[15 f.] 34
18[16] 35
18[16] 35
18[17 f.] 34
18[17] 79
18[24] 25, 28
19 59
19[9] 59
22[41] 107
23[1] 107
23[2] 105
23[4] 105
23[14] 105, 107
23[29] 107
23[30] 105
25[13] 75
27[21–23] 262
28 f. 273 ff., 279, 291, 306 ff.
28 302, 332
28[2] 21
28[3] 350
28[6] 78
28[8] 78, 81
28[11] 403
28[13] 79
28[16] 353
28[18] 386
28[24] 79
28[26–31] 158
28[26] 272
28[27] 78
29 312
29[1] 303
29[2] 78
29[6] 79
29[7–11] 158
29[8] 78
29[13] 78
29[36] 78
31 23
31[50] 23, 75
35[25] 259
35[28] 258
35[33] 75

Deuteronomy
3[11] 106
8[3] 100
10[8] 248
12[22] 403
12[27] 104
13[17] [E.V. 18] 5
14[4] 346
14[7] 403
14[22] 398
14[23–27] 37
14[29] 46
15[19–23] 34
15[19 f.] 405
16 276 f., 336
16[1–8] 368, 373
16[1] 343, 353
16[2] 344, 354, 400
16[3] 373
16[4] 340, 354
16[5] 354
16[6] 340, 354
16[7] 276, 354, 357, 372
16[9 ff.] 297
16[9] 333
16[10] 46, 276
16[13] 276
16[16 f.] 46, 95
17[8–11] 205
18[1] 10, 11, 12
18[3 f.] 47
18[6] 217
21[1–9] 31
24[8] 205
26 29, 46, 94
26[1–11] 29, 329
26[2] 398
26[5 ff.] 379
32[28] 400
33 213, 220, 245, 250, 255
33[2] 201
33[5] 180
33[8–11] 254 f.
33[8] 220, 254
33[10] 5, 220, 237

Joshua
3[6] 198
4 103
5[9] 102
5[10] 353
6 198
7[26] 106
8[29] 106
9[21] 233
9[24,27] 233
12[23] 102
13[14] 11
22[10 f.] 105
24[33] 229
24[25 ff.] 120

Judges
3[16] 398

Judges
3[17] 18
5[1] 189
5[25] 18
6 90, 114 ff., 131
6[11-21] 115
6[19-21] 399
6[19] 404
6[25-32] 115
6[25] f. 403
6[25] 405
9[12] 400
9[13] 22
11[34] 189
13 114 ff.
13[15] 404
13[19] 404
16[23] 400
17 f. 198, 216, 254

1 Samuel
1-4 198
1[14] 93, 400
1[21] 400
1[24] f. 403
1[24] 399, 405
2[12] f. 220
2[17] 398
2[18] 259
2[22] b 190
2[22] 11, 12, 259, 260
2[29] 401
3[14] 85, 401
5[6] 183
6[8] 183
6[10] 405
6[14] 403, 404, 405
6[15] 400
7[6] 400, 401
7[9] 5, 350, 403
9 93, 132
10[1] 259
10[3] f. 399
10[5] 400, 404
10[27] 17
11[14] f. 104
11[15] 104, 400, 401
13[8-10] 104
14 114 ff., 119, 120, 123, 124, 221
14[3] 259
14[32-35] 134
14[33] 370, 403
14[34] 403
15[21] 403
15[22] 404

1 Samuel
15[33] 104
16[2] 403
16[13] 259
18[6] 189
20[38] 106
21[4] ff. 399
22[18] 218, 259
22[19] 218
23[6] 259
26[19] 14, 22, 83, 84, 85, 398
30[7] 259

2 Samuel
4[10] 58
6[13] 403, 404
6[16] f. 136
12[4-6] 404
18[20] 58
21 131
23[16] 400, 401
24 84 f., 90, 131, 132, 137
24[18] 131
24[22-25] 403
24[25] 131

1 Kings
1[9] 120, 403, 404
1[19] 403, 404
1[25] 403, 404
1[51] 136
2[35] 229
2[28] f. 136
5[1] [E.V. 4[21]] 17
6 f. 134
6[20,22] 98, 134
7[15-22] 136
8 ff. 134
8[10,11] 167
8[12, 13] 149
8[22] 135
8[27] 151
8[54] 135
8[62] 400
8[64] 135, 136, 137, 138
9[25] 135, 136, 137
12[29] f. 229
12[31] 240, 251, 254
12[32] f. 298
13[2] 218
13[33] 217
18[27-33] 403

1 Kings
18[29, 36] 4
19[16] 259

2 Kings
3[27] 86, 119
4 314
9[24] 250
10[19] 183
11 314
11[18] 257
12 61
12[7, 10] 257
12[17] [E.V. 16] 37
16[13] 400
16[14] f. 138
16[15] 400
17[28] 229
17[32] 217
19[2] 257
23[4] 257
23[6] 184
23[8] f. 217
23[9] 227
23[20] 217
23[21] 353
23[22] 353
23[23] 353
25[18] 257

1 Chronicles
5[34] [E.V. 6[8]] 229
5[40] [E.V. 6[14]] 230
11[18] 400
12[24-41] [E.V. 23-40] 214
15[4] 228
21[16] 133
22[1] 134
23[4] f. 214
23[24] 349
23[28] 228
23[32] 228
24 229
24[5] 229
28[11-20] 155
28[19] 156
29[14] 45

2 Chronicles
3[1] 132
4[1] 134, 138, 139
8[13] 353
15[3] 223
17[7-9] 223, 237

2 Chronicles
30[1] 353
30[2] 353
30[6] 353
30[14] 97
30[15] 353, 354
30[16] 355
30[17] 354
30[18] 354
31[4 f.] 25, 402
31[5] 26
34[5] 183
35[1] 353, 354
35[2] 223
35[3] 237
35[6] 354
35[7–9] 354
35[7] 345
35[11] 353, 354, 355
35[12] 353
35[13] 354
35[16] 353
35[17] 353
35[18] 353
35[19] 353

Ezra
2 214, 226, 231
2[40–58] 234
2[40] 236
2[41] 188
2[63] 237
2[65] 188
2[70] 188
3[5] 141
6[19] 353
6[20] 354
6[21] 354
7[24] 234
8[2] 229
8[15–20] 235
8[17] 235
8[18 f.] 236
8[20] 235, 237

Nehemiah
3[37] [E.V. 4[6]] 69
6[15] 281
7 214, 226, 231
7[67] 188
8[7–9] 223
8[15] 293
9 312
10 28 f.
10[29–31] [E.V. 28–30] 236

Nehemiah
10[34 38] [E.V. 32–37] 29
10[35] [E.V. 34] 13
10[36] [E.V. 35] 29
10[38] [E.V. 37] 29
12[10 f.] 262
12[27] 281
13[31] 13

Esther
9[17–19] 280

Job
22[13] 149
42[7 f.] 86

Psalm
16[4] 400
19[6] [E.V. 5] 300
20[4] [E.V. 3] 401
32[1] 68
33[16] 303
40 48, 50
42[9] [E.V. 8] 169
50 21
51 48, 50
51[21] [E.V. 19] 5
68[12] [E.V. 11] 189
68[25 ff.] [E.V. 24 ff.] 189
72[10] 18
74[19] 404
78[71] 405
81[4] [E.V. 3] 303
99 194, 198
99[6 f.] 194
104[28] 300
113–118 379
115[10, 12] 228
118[3] 228
118[6, 10, 14 f., 17, 22, 26] 381
135[19] 228

Proverbs
7[14] 7

Song of Solomon
2[13] 404
6[1] 106

Isaiah
1[10–17] 41

Isaiah
1[11 ff.] 139
1[11] 404
1[13] 14
1[18] 71
6[1] 258
19[21] 401
25[2] 106
28[7 ff.] 93, 400
40[11] 405
40[16] 300
57[6] 401
60[8] 404
63[16] 149
65[3] 97
65[11] 98

Jeremiah
2[28] 217
7[18] 106, 400
7[21 f.] 41
8[7] 404
11[13] 217
14[12] 401
18[18] 223
18[23] 68, 69
19[1] 257
19[5] 87
19[13] 400
20[1] 257
29[25 ff.] 257
32[29] 400
34[18] 403
36 314
44[17–19, 25] 400
48[7] 184

Ezekiel
6[13] 78
7[26] 223
9[3] 149
16[19] 78
20[28] 78, 400
20[41] 78
29[17] 301
30[20] 301
39[19–20] 100
40–48 64, 226
40[1] 301, 311
40[4] 154
40[39–42] 64
40[39] 64
41[21 f.] 98
41[22] 99
42[13] 64, 65

Ezekiel
43[10, 11] 154
43[13–17] 139
43[13 f.] 97, 138
43[19–26] 64
44[7] 233
44[9] 227
44[10] 217, 227
44[11] 99, 227, 233
44[12] 217
44[18] 227
44[15 ff.] 99
44[15] 227
44[16] 98, 100
44[27] 64
44[28 f.] 65
44[29] 64
45[15–17] 75, 76
45[15] 5
45[17] 400
45[18–23] 274
45[18 ff.] 309
45[18] 275, 309, 359
45[19–26] 64
45[20] 275, 301, 309
45[21–23] 275
45[21 f.] 353
45[22] 274
45[25] 275
46[1–16] 274

Ezekiel
46[14 f.] 399
46[20] 64, 65, 399

Daniel
9[26] 264

Hosea
2 95
2[7] [E.V. [5]] 45
2[10] [E.V. [8]] 45
2[13] [E.V. [11]] 95. 277
4 95
4[4] 184
4[8] 61
4[15] 104
6[4–6] 41
8[11] 61
9[4] 400
9[15] 104
10[5] 184
12[12] [E.V. [11]] 104, 106, 403

Amos
4[4] 41, 104
4[5] 27, 399

Amos
5[5] 104
5[15] 89
5[21–25] 41
5[21] 22
5[22] 401, 404
5[25] 17, 401
8[5] 277, 313

Micah
3[11] 223
6 88
6[6–8] 41, 42
6[6] 350, 403, 405
6[7] 88, 399, 404

Zephaniah
1[4] 184

Haggai
2[13] 141

Malachi
1[6 b–8] 100
1[7] 98, 100
1[11] 100
1[12] 98, 100

## (*b*) APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Apocalypse of Baruch
21[23] 162
Apocalypse of Paul
44 168
Assumption of Isaiah
7[10] 149
Barnabas, Epistle of,
7[8] 320
Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira)
3[30] 72, 74
31[19 ff.] 48
32[1 ff.] 48 f.
35[12 ff.] 49
45[6–24] 228
46[16] 350
50[11] 259

Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira)
50[13] 228
50[15] 401
50[16] 228
Enoch
22 162
1 Esdras
5 214 f.
4 Esdras
4[41] 162
Hermas, *Mand.*
10, 3[2] 168
*Sim.*
8, 2[5] 168
Jubilees
6[18] 158

Jubilees
7[5] 78
12[16 ff.] 297
15[1] 286, 332
16[3] 286
16[11] 286
16[31] 293
17[15] 299
18[19] 299
49 354
49[1] 339, 340, 353
49[6] 375
49[9] 354
49[12] 339, 340
49[16] 365, 382
49[16 ff.] 372

Jubilees
49[16] 339, 382
49[19 f.] 355
49[19] 339
49[20] 365
Judith
8[6] 278
15[12 f.] 189
1 Maccabees
1[21] 142, 145
4[45] 141
4[47] 140
4[49] 142, 145
4[56] 290
4[59] 280, 290
1 Maccabees
7[9] 264
7[14] 228, 264
7[43] 279
7[48 f.] 279
8[20] 265
12[3] 265
14[41] 265
2 Maccabees
1[10] 259
3[4] 263
4[7–10] 263
4[23–26] 263
4[23 f.] 263
4[25] 263
2 Maccabees
4[29] 264
10[1 ff.] 291
10[7] 292
14[2] 264
14[7] 264
15[36] 280
Testament of Levi
3[1] 157
3[5] 156, 158
3[6] 74
Tobit
1[7] 228
2[1] 272

## (*c*) NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew
5[23, 24] 5, 18
8[4] 18
9[13] 45
23[18] 18
26[17] 390, 391
27[41] 270
Mark
1[44] 18
7[11] 18
14[12] 385, 390, 391
15[31] 270
Luke
2[41] 383
22[7] 390
22[8] 391
22[15] 391
22[19] 395
John
2[13] 383
2[23] 383
6[4] 383
10[22] 290
12[1] 386
12[2] 387
12[12] 387
12[13] 387
13[1] 387
13[12] 387
13[23] 387
13[25] 387
13[26] 387
13[29] 387
18[1] 387
18[28] 387
19[14] 387
John
19[31] 387, 388
19[36] 388
19[42] 387, 389
20[1] 387, 389
Acts
12[4] 383
17[23] 97
20[6] 383
21[28 f.] 38
27[9] 307
Romans
13[13] 378
1 Corinthians
5[7 f.] 397
5[7] 348, 383, 389
10[21] 100
11[25] 395
11[26] 395, 396
15[20] 389
Hebrews
2[17] 74, 182
5[4] 228
5[5] 182
7[11] 228
7[25] 176
8[1 f.] 176
9[1] 52
9[11 f.] 176
9[22] 76
9[24] 176
10[12] 176
11[28] 383
12[2] 176
Jude
24 174
Revelation
4–7 160 ff., 164 ff.
4[1] 160, 165
4[2] 161, 162
6[9] 162
7[15] 161
8 171
8[1–3] 160
8[1] 167
8[2–5] 168
8[3–5] 169, 170
8[3] 170
9[13 f.] 168
10 165
10[1] 162
10[4] 162
11[1] 164, 169
11[19] 150, 160, 164
13[8] 163
14[2] 165
14[13] 165
14[15] 164
14[17] 164
14[18] 165
15 166
15[5 f.] 164
15[5] 164, 167
15[6] 164
15[8] 164, 167
16[1] 164
16[4] 164
16[7] 166
16[8] 164
16[17] 164

# VIII. POST-BIBLICAL JEWISH AUTHORITIES

## (*a*) RABBINIC


B^erakhoth 1[1] 340
Bikkurim 1[3] 398
2[3] 29
3[6] 331
Shabbath 2[6] 295
2[7] 295
T.B. 21 b 293
T.B. 23 a 292
T.B. 121 b 81
P^esaḥim 1[1] 385
1[4] 385
2[1 ff.] 385
2[8] 374
4[1] 386
5[1] 337
5[3] 338
5[8 f.] 353
5[5] 365
5[6] 355
7[4] 353
7[5] 353
7[18] 372
8[2] 345, 350
8[3] 373
8[7] 373
9[5] 357
9[8] 350
10[1] 375, 376
10[2] 375
10[3] 377
10[4] 373, 375, 379
10[5] 374, 379
10[8] 375, 377
10[9] 340
Gemara 99 a ll. 15 ff. 376
Yoma 1[1] 312
1[3 f.] 269
1[6] 269
6[2] 317
6[4] 320
8[9] 321
Yoma T.B. 5 a 76
Sukkah 3 293
3[12] 294
5[2] 294
Rosh Hash-shanah 1[1] 300
3[7 f.] 304
T.B. 10 b 299
T.B. 18 b 278
Ta'anith 2[10] 279
2[14] 277
4[8] 282
4[8] 283
T.J. 66 a 278
M^egillah 1[3] 283
T.J. 70 d 278
Ḥagigah T.B. 12 b 169
K^ethubboth 3[9] 265
4[3] 265
N^edarim T.J. 40 d 278
Nazir 5[5] 39
Ḳiddushin 4[6] 265
Baba Bathra 8[6] 81
Sanhedrin T.J. 10 b 342
11 ab 342
18 bcd 343
Tosephta ii. 342
Abhoth 3[10] 81
Horaioth 3[4] 266
3[8] 268
Zebaḥim 6[29] 169
10[5] 38, 58
M^enaḥoth 3[6] 10
10 323, 326 ff.
10[9] 336
10 a 169
B^ekhoroth 1[3] 350
1[4] 350
3[1] 350
K^erithoth 6[9] 345
Middoth 3[4] 141, 142
Parah 1[3, 4] 350

## (*b*) GREEK AUTHORS


(i) JOSEPHUS
Ant. iii. 7[7] 152
10[5] 325, 342, 353, 354
10[7] 10
iv. 4[4] 18
vi. 12[6] 218
ix. 13[3] 354
xii. 7[7] 290, 291
9[7] 264
10[5] 279
xiii. 9[1] 280
10[6] 265
10[7] 179
11[1] 179
xiv. 2[1] 282
xv. 3[1] 266
xx. 10 265
10[3] 264, 265
Bell. Iud. i. 2[3] 179
3[1] 179
ii. 17[6] 282
iv. 3[6] 266
3[8] 266
v. 3 390
3[1] 385
5[4–7] 152
5[6] 141
vi. 9[3] 337, 373

(i) JOSEPHUS
Cont. Ap. i. 22 140, 141
22[4] 18
26 194
ii. 9 294

(ii) PHILO
De Cong. 19 341, 347
De Dec. 30 342, 376
De Mon. ii. 1 175
De Praem. Sac. 1 24
2 36
De Septen. 2 307
18 338, 341, 354, 376, 378
19 286, 299, 341, 342
20 324f.
22 299
23 307
24 286
De Vict. Off. 4 141, 146
De Vit. Mos. ii. 1 180
iii. 1 180
3 174
10 175
29 f. 341, 347, 353
29 179, 341, 342, 347, 376
39 180, 194


Printed in England at the Oxford University Press

8461 K

DATE DUE

BS
680
.S2
G7

16,590

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN
Gray, George
See Librarian
Sacrifice in the Old Testa
3 0645 0001 9987 3